DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 056 983 SP 005 381

AUTHOR	Helburn, Suzanne W.; And Others
TITLE	Colorado TTT Estes Park Conference Report.
INSTITUTION	Social Science Education Consortium, Inc., Boulder, Colo.
SPONS AGENCY	Colorado Commission on Higher Education, Denver.
PUB DATE	Nov 71
NOTE	126p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	Curriculum Development; Educational Change; *Effective Teaching; *Preservice Education; *Program Descriptions; *Teacher Education; *Teacher Educator Education
IDENTIFIERS	Colorado

ABSTRACT

This conference report is organized to follow the conference schedule and includes edited versions of three papers, as well as of the final plenary session. The paper by Suzanne Wiggins Helburn is titled "Trends and Issues in Teacher Education in Colorado" and summarizes the trends which were indicated by a survey of the state programs. Topics considered included innovations in the curriculum and general program characteristics in both college and university programs and in school based programs, the preservice curriculum, optimum use of the education labor force, and change agents and external financing. The paper by Donald N. Bigelow, "Freedom, Process, and Colorado," considers the changing interpretation of freedom in an educational context, the importance of the individual, and the problems involved in bringing about the desired changes. Elwyn Richardson compares trends in education in England, New Zealand, and the United States, pointing out that good, unstructured teaching calls for far more work on the part of the teacher than formal education does, and describing instances of successful teaching. The question and answer sessions which followed each of these papers are also included. Appendixes list the conferences participants, conference staff, and schedule, and also include a directory of alternative teacher education programs in Colorado. (MBM)

ED056983

NOV 16 1971

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Colorado TTT

estes park conference report november 1971

SP005381

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword. i

Preface And Acknowledgements. iv

Trends and Issues in Teacher Education in Colorado 1
by Suzanne Wiggins Helburn

Freedom, Process, and Colorado 18
by Donald N. Bigelow

New Programs in Teacher Education in Colorado 34

Trends in Education in England, New Zealand, and the 37
United States: A Comparison
by Elwyn Richardson

Final Plenary Session 52

Appendix

Conference Participants and Staff 63

Conference Schedule 70

Colorado Innovates: A Directory of Alternative 74
Teacher Education Programs

FOREWORD

EDUCATING FOR GREATNESS

by

Moses C. Davis

"Greater than the tread of mighty armies is the power of an idea whose time has come."

This thought by Victor Hugo is, perhaps, the underlying realization that compels many educators to actively search for more relevant, meaningful, and effective ways to play their varied (even kaleidoscopic) roles in answering today's awesome challenge, not only to the survival of the nation's educational system, but also to the political framework of a country which--with all of its glaring imperfections--has the potential for being truly the greatest people's republic in the world.

As we look at Hugo's thought against a background of the nation's potential for multidimensional greatness and the role of education in effecting this greatness--or providing the setting for such greatness--several points stand out:

1. The professings of our system are in collision with the protestings of our inconsistencies, inadequacies, and injustices.
2. Elements of the "system" must mobilize to respond (not react) to the charges brought forth in the wide array of demonstrations and protestations.
3. The unrest (euphemistically speaking) which is now appearing as early as the junior high school level will intensify and occur earlier yet, unless educators become more responsive to the needs of students and the adults in their lives.
4. Schools are the institution which come in contact with every family in the nation; therefore, schools can be the overall vehicle or channel through which we can deal creatively, imaginatively, and honestly (!) with the very real danger of "the fate of Rome" that slumbers at our national doorstep. It was internal decay--not the might of an external foe--that defeated Rome.
5. The schism between the larger community and one important facet of the community called schools must be eliminated.

The school is a part of the community, not apart from the community.

Of course this list could be expanded and refined for more specificity. However, this very brief discussion is intedned only to provide some points of departure from which each concerned reader can move earnestly toward the specifics which command high priority consideration in his own unique arena.

Each of us will understandably gravitate toward different foci in our efforts to respond to the call to arms of the day. Each of us, not unlike the blind men "seeing" the elephant, will choose different things as the identifying characteristic of the enemy to be attacked. Each of us will develop different skills in grappling with a common danger. Yet all of us must recognize bigotry, poverty, mediocrity, low expectation, and accompanying poor achievement as barriers to greatness.

America's potential for greatness can be translated into reality only in direct relationship to America's sincere efforts to educate for this greatness. And this means a complete redirecting (revolution, if you will) that results in the schools' becoming agencies for liberating individuals, including the educators, to become contributors to a healthy society at their highest levels of skill and compentency.

This country has long professed a high regard for the relationship between education (even in its broadest sense) and a viable society, and has produced a myriad of documents and expressions which reveal a nation's aspirations and frustrations. Four such documents and expressions come immediately to mind in this context: The Northwest Ordinance of 1787, the Constitution of the United States of America, an idea from the great mind of Frederick Douglass, and a sentence from Eldridge Cleaver's Soul On Ice.

"Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged."

"We the People of the United States. . . do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

Wording in the first document, the Northwest Ordinance, proclaims an early awareness of the education-society interrelationship and a commitment to work toward a sound society; wording of the second document, the Consitution, tells us that the people wrested power from an absolute ruler and distributed power among the various facets of the citizenry. (Could that have been the

first movement of "power to the people"?) Yet, the aspiration of citizen responsibility on this high plane met with, and is even today meeting with, diverse obstacles to greatness and with instances of annoying unfulfillments which ultimately encumber us all.

If we are to escape the shackles of an imprisoning and enslaving society, we must ourselves strike the first blow. We must strike vigorous and telling blows at the many enemies within our gates (a paraphrasing of words of Frederick Douglass).*

Eldridge Cleaver reveals an interesting and most dangerous kind of foe in these words: "The price of hating other human beings is loving oneself less."

So, you see, we are faced with a profound moment of truth. We can look at the history of the world and at the history of this nation, and can intellectually realize that the nature and quality of the future--or <u>if</u> there is to be a future--is indeed in our hands; we cannot risk allowing base emotionalism to reduce us to extinction.

The time has truly come; Hugo's words could not be more apropos. Mobilizing the multifaceted resources of the state of Colorado for the reciprocal benefit of the citizen and the state is an idea that is quite late in coming (returning)--but it is here! Power to the people in this "idea whose time has come."

Moses C. Davis
Director, Colorado TTT
Colorado Commission on
Higher Education, 1969-71

*"Hereditary bondmen! Know ye not Who would be free, themselves must strike the blow?" Dr James McCune Smith, "Introduction" In <u>My Bondage and My Freedom</u>. Frederick Douglass. New York: Miller, Orton, and Mulligan, 1855. p. xxiii

PREFACE AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

PREFACE AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Estes Park Conference was held August 1, 2, and 3, 1971, at Estes Park, Colorado, as the culmination of the Colorado TTT Program (Training the Trainers of Teachers). One hundred and eleven persons representing all phases of the educational spectrum--from producer to consumer--engaged in a dialogue on current trends and issues in teacher education within the state of Colorado.

The variety of the participants' backgrounds and interests, and the specific concern with the state of Colorado, lent a unique flavor to the Estes Park Conference and engendered in the participants a sincere hope that plans for cooperative future ventures to improve teacher education in Colorado would meet with success.

The Final Report is organized to follow the conference schedule. Transcripts from tapes made at the conference have been edited for clarity; however, no content changes have been made.

M. C. Davis, Director, Colorado TTT, has written an inspiring foreword, entitled "Educating for Greatness," especially for this report. Mr. Davis, a former public school teacher and administrator, indicates his concerns for education and educators in the United States.

At the initial session on Sunday afternoon, Dr. Suzanne Wiggins Helburn, Director of the TTT Follow-Through Program, presented a paper entitled "Trends and Issues in Teacher Education in Colorado," in which she summarized the findings of a survey of teacher education practices, conducted as part of the follow-through program. Her paper is presented in Part One of the Final Report. Participants were then given the opportunity to react to these findings and to indicate issues which they felt were paramount in teacher education. A summary of these reactions was done by Dr. Helburn for this report.

Dr. Donald Bigelow, Director, Division of College Programs, U. S. Office of Education, addressed the participants Sunday evening on the topic of a statewide effort to improve teacher education. His address, "Freedom, Process, and Colorado," makes up the second part of this report.

Monday, the second day of the conference, presentations were given, describing innovative teacher education programs in Colorado. Brief descriptions of these presentations are contained in Part Three.

Elwyn Richardson, staff member of the Mountain View Center for Environmental Education, Boulder, Colorado, addressed the participants after lunch on Monday.

Mr. Richardson's insights into educational practices in the United States, as compared with those in New Zealand and England, provided material for an informative, provocative, and delightful presentation.

At the Final Plenary Session on Tuesday morning, presided over by Dr. Norman Dodge, Assistant Director of the Colorado Commission on Higher Education, the participants formed three discussion groups to develop directions for teacher education in the state of Colorado. The entire group then reassembled to act on the resolutions of the three separate sessions. The transcript of that final, full-group session constitutes the last part of this report.

Included in the Final Conference Report as appendices are a list of conference participants and staff, the conference schedule, and "Colorado Innovates: A Directory of Alternative Teacher Education Programs," written especially for the conference.

Grateful acknowledgement is made to Dr. Frank Abbott and Dr. Norman Dodge of the Colorado Commission on Higher Education; to Dr. Irving Morrissett of the Social Science Education Consortium, Inc.; and to Dr. Suzanne Wiggins Helburn for their advice and assistance on the format and development of the Final Report; to Miss Karen Wiley for editorial assistance; and to Mrs. Rachel Sennert for secretarial and production assistance.

This Final Report was written as part of a subcontract to the Social Science Education Consortium, Inc., from the Colorado Commission on Higher Education. As such, it constitutes the final document produced under the Colorado TTT grant. It is the sincere hope of the producers, however, that it is seen, not as the end of a project, but as the beginning of a statewide effort towards communication, coordination, and cooperation in the training of teachers in the state of Colorado.

Frances Haley

PART ONE

Afternoon Sessions

Sunday, August 1, 1971

TRENDS AND ISSUES IN TEACHER EDUCATION IN COLORADO

BY Suzanne Wiggins Helburn

I. INTRODUCTION

This paper summarizes the findings of a survey (completed in the springs of 1971) of innovative teacher education practices in Colorado. The study grew out of the Colorado Training the Trainers of Teachers (TTT) program which was a part of the national TTT effort initiated in 1967 under the Education Professions Development Act.

The major purposes of this paper are to summarize the trends in teacher education reform which seem apparent from the survey, and then to raise some issues which these trends suggest. Hopefully, these very personal reactions to the current state of the art and to the problems in teacher education will spark further discussions and explorations among conferees in the next two days.

Because the TTT program provided the context and philosophic orientation for carrying out the survey, it is well to summarize TTT philosophy and objectives. The major purpose of TTT is to promote the restructuring of teacher training programs by creating a group of effective change agents in teacher training institutions and in the public schools. The spirit of TTT is expressed vividly by Don Davies, Deputy Commissioner for Educational Personnel Development, U. S. Office of Education, in his foreword to the TTT Phoenix Conference Report, The Liberal Arts and Teacher Education: A Confrontation.*

> Before becoming a civil servant and before the passage of the Education Professions Development Act of 1967, I wrote that teacher education was the slum of American education. It appeared to me to be an economically disadvantaged, largely neglected, and dangerously isolated enterprise. Included in my indictment were the liberal arts academic departments (which, after all, do so much of teacher education) and their faculty and administrators, as well as those in schools of education, where, all too often, research is emphasized at the expense of training. The indictment necessarily included all related parts of teacher education--the graduate schools, professional associations, state and local educational agencies, and the Office of Education. Together they testified unmistakably to the unbelievably low priority that society was giving to the education of our teachers.

---

*Donald N. Bigelow, ed., The Liberal Arts and Teacher Education: A Confrontation. Lincoln, Nebraska: Univ. of Nebraska Press, 1971. pp. ix, xi, xii.

It seemed important then, and is no less important today, that unless all of these groups do everything in their power to reform the way our educators are trained, and unless they do it <u>together</u>, our separate efforts will fail to produce better schools.

The situation cannot be corrected by changing certification requirements. It cannot be changed by packaging and labeling educational content in slightly different ways. It cannot be corrected by inviting academics and pedagogues to serve on the same committees, in the hope that dialogue will result in significant improvement of what is called, pejoratively, 'teacher education.' A much more fundamental change is required--a change in the spirit and in the content of the undergraduate preparation of teachers, perhaps even a change in the very purpose and ethos of our institutions of higher education.

There are a few themes which I believe are of fundamental importance in this reorganization of the liberal arts for teachers, and, hence, for all undergraduates. In the briefest way they include:

> the integration of knowledge so that people can solve problems which do not conform to the conventional disciplinary boundaries;
>
> the integration of the cognitive and affective development of human beings;
>
> bringing important new talent, from neglected or excluded sources, into programs of preparation and into schools;
>
> individualizing education;
>
> the provision of a richly multicultural experience for all who will teach;
>
> joining the content and style of the liberal arts to the modes of professional education;
>
> creating working coalitions among schools, colleges, communities, professional organizations, and government agencies.

Thus, the national TTT effort has been directed towards developing effective pre- and inservice training models for teacher trainers which emphasize, among other characteristics: parity among the groups involved in providing teacher education (college/university education and liberal arts

faculty, public school personnel, community resource people); new ways of building genuine community participation in educational programs; preparation of teachers to work effectively with minority children.

The Colorado program was organized around two summer workshops in 1969 and 1970 to give participants personal experience with ghetto life which would enable them to organize more effective teacher education programs. Participants represented a critical mix of people involved in teacher education curriculum design and implementation. The program focused on participants':

1) learning through direct contact with the life styles of minority, disadvantaged children;

2) developing more effective ways for teachers to base their instruction on an awareness of their students' learning needs and abilities;

3) finding forms of cooperation between representatives of the critical mix of teacher trainers;

4) finding ways for community members to participate in making decisions about the education of their children.

In February 1971, the Colorado Commission contracted with the Social Science Education Consortium (SSEC) to carry out the final stage of the Colorado TTT program--an evaluation of the program to identify possible next steps.

The follow-through program involved SSEC staff in interviewing TTT participants and their institutional representatives. During these interviews we learned of many programs around the state designed to achieve goals stressed by the national TTT program. Furthermore, we began to identify innovations which seemed to be common to many programs. Professional semesters or years, early field experience, competency-based training, community involvement, cross-cultural awareness, and public school/university cooperation are just a few examples of the new directions.

To get a clear picture of the statewide pattern of innovation, we decided to inventory teacher education programs at all institutions of higher education in Colorado and at as many public schools as seemed feasible. In order to do as systematic a survey as our budget would allow, we visited or contacted by phone all institutions in the state offering courses required for certification. In most cases, initial contact was made with the dean of the school of education or chairman of the education department. Our interviews

then branched out to other persons identified by deans, department chairmen and colleagues.

Budget limitations did not permit a system-by-system inventory of inservice teacher education programs within the public schools. Instead, we relied on leads provided by the persons interviewed in the colleges and later in the public schools. Undoubtedly, there are many more programs being conducted throughout Colorado representative of the type and quality of program which will achieve TTT objectives. Nevertheless, the programs we heard about suggest the variety of approaches which are being used to provide needed inservice teacher education in different regions in the state.

Because the survey grew out of an interest in identifying innovations related to TTT objectives, it is neither comprehensive nor exhaustive. It focuses on programs which are designed to train teachers to work with children from ethnic minorities or which are generally applicable, whatever the target public school student population. Furthermore, the emphasis is on the professional training core curriculum programs and comprehensive changes in teacher education. Specialized programs in fields like preschool, special education and instructional methods are not included at all.

The survey identifies 22 programs which we considered to be innovative in conception. It is a survey rather than an evaluation, because we did not attempt to assess (though we did form some opinions on) the effectiveness of the innovations. The data were compiled from interviews with project organizers, sometimes with students or teacher participants in the programs, and from written information made available to us by the project directors. Summary knowledge of these innovative models provides a valuable starting place for analyzing teacher education reform in Colorado.

Twelve programs are university or college based and ten of these provice preservice training. The other nine projects have been organized in public schools and all but one of these emphasize inservice training. Short program descriptions appear in Appendix C, "Colorado Innovates: A Directory of Alternative Teacher Education Programs."

This delineation of responsibility for teacher education between the public schools and colleges is, perhaps, the most important and obvious trend. The fact that colleges prepare teachers and the school districts repair them is well known. (It is also an overgeneralization, since teachers do go on earning graduate credits and degrees throughout their teaching careers. This graduate work is possibly the major form of inservice training,

but it is training initiated by the teacher himself.) The validity of the division of responsibility is one that seems worth questioning, however, and will be discussed again in Section III of this paper.

To facilitate comparisons, Table 1 summarizes the characteristics of each program. The table categorizes the programs into those which are university/college based and those based in the public schools. With the exception of the three cases noted above, the table also classifies programs according to pre- and inservice orientation. The table is a checklist of program characteristics. The columns list the important curricular and general characteristics. The Xs or dashes in a given row show the characteristics of the program listed in that row. (Dashes instead of Xs indicate programs still in the planning stage. Notes following the table provide additional information useful in interpreting the table.)

II. TRENDS IN TEACHER EDUCATION: COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY PRESERVICE PROGRAMS

Innovations in the Curriculum

Professional Semester. A major innovation is the professional semester or year (sometimes years), usually in the senior year. These programs usually require students to free their schedules completely to enroll full-time in education courses. Often, students spend most of at least one semester in some sort of community or public school teaching or service work. These programs involve a reorganization of professional courses to include more field experience, more flexibility in scheduling for students, more integration of field experience with methods and foundations courses. All new programs have more extensive field experience than has been normal in Colorado. Although this in itself requires more cooperation between the colleges and the schools, sometimes this cooperation extends to the use of public school personnel to teach methods and other courses in the preservice programs. Adams State-Los Alamos and the Cherry Creek-University of Colorado programs are examples of this type of cooperation.

Early Field Experience. Although there are only a few places where students get experience early in their college program observing or aiding teachers in the public schools, there is considerable interest in finding ways to provide such experience. There are, however, serious problems to overcome. College students must decide that they want to become teachers early in their freshman

or sophomore year. The programs require extensive administrative work by colleges and public schools. In some areas of the state there is a problem of finding enough cooperating schools to handle the increased load of teaching assistants. Finally, there may be added expenses for travel and supervision.

Competency-Based Curricula. A new interest, if not yet a trend, is competency-based curricula requiring the identification of competencies, the identification of criterion level competence required of students, and the development of learning modules to help students acquire the competencies. Teacher Corps programs and the Master of Arts in Teaching program being developed at Southern Colorado State College focus on training students to acquire specific competencies. An interesting and related approach to teacher preparation based on behavior modification techniques from applied psychology is being developed by Joel Greenspoon and two colleagues at Temple Buell College.

Preparation for Work with Ethnic Minorities. Courses on minority problems and awareness training or sensitivity training exist in most schools, but as electives. There is little explicit focus in the required curriculum on preparing students to work with children from ethnic minority groups. The programs devoted to preparing teachers for teaching ethnic minority children are all limited to students who have a special desire to teach in such situations. These include the two Teacher Corps projects, the two programs based at the University of Northern Colorado, and the new program at the University of Colorado Denver Center.

Integration of Liberal Arts and Professional Training. There is only one existing program with considerable liberal arts involvement. It is the University of Northern Colorado-Manual High School Program under the direction of Donald Luketich. It is broadly integrative and, among other things, the preservice teacher education component integrates the entire four year college experience of future teachers. Other programs which are just getting under way, but which will work toward integration of liberal arts and professional preparation are the Undergraduate Pre-Service Teacher Education Program at the University of Colorado at Boulder, directed by John Haas, and the program at the University of Colorado Denver Center, designed by Donald Gallo.

TABLE 1
CHARACTERISTICS OF
INNOVATIVE TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS
IN COLORADO--July, 1971

University-College Centered Programs	Curriculum Characteristics: Professional Semester-yr.	Preservice Field Experience: Early	Preservice Field Experience: Extens.	Competency Based	Individualization	Psychological Preparation	Cross-Cultural Experience	Special Training on Ethnic Minorities	Liberal Arts Involvement	Grade Level: Elem.	Grade Level: Second.	Professional Level: Pre/InService: Pre-	Professional Level: Pre/InService: In-	Participant Selection Procedure: Volunteer	Participant Selection Procedure: Selected	Special public school-college cooperation	Community Involvement	General Program Characteristics: Scope: Limited	Scope: School-wide	Project Status: Concluded	Project Status: Current	Project Status: In Planning	Financing: Amount	Financing: Source
1. Adams State/Los Alamos Cooperative Teacher Education Project	X		X						X		X		X		X		12		X			$ 15,500 3,950	College District
2. Adams State College Teacher Corps	X		X	X	X			X	X		X			X	X	X	30			X		200,000 (2 yrs)	U.S.O.E.
3. Colorado, University of UPSTEP	--	--	--		--				--	--	--	--	--	--		--	--	600*				--	347,000 (15 mos)	N.S.F.
4. Colorado, University of UCITE	--	--	--	--	--	?			--		--					--			180			--	--	University
5. Colorado, University of Denver Center--Teacher Preparation for Urban Schools	--		--			--	--	--	--		--	--		--		--	--	30				--	60,000 11,000	Noyes Found. University
6. Colorado State University Project Communi-Link													X		X	X				X		550,000 (2 yrs)	U.S.O.E.
7. Loretta Heights College Early Field Experience	X	X						X		X	X	X		X						X		--	College
8. Northern Colorado, University of--Teacher Training for Inner City Schools	X		X		X	X	X	X		X	X	X		X		X	X	48			X		--	University
9. Northern Colorado, University of/Manual High School Project		X	X					X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	60 JUNC	105 Manual		X		267,000 (2 yrs)	Denver Schools Model Cities University
10. Southern Colorado State College Teacher Corps	X		X	X	X		X	X		X		X	X	X		X	X	32			X		500,000 (2 yrs)	U.S.O.E.
11. Southern Colorado State College Master of Arts in Teaching				--	--			--		--	--		--		--				--			--	--	University

CHARACTERISTICS OF INNOVATIVE TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN COLORADO--continued

	Curriculum Characteristics														General Program Characteristics															
	Professional Semester - yr		Preservice Field Experience		Competency Based	Individualization	Psychological Preparation	Cross-Cultural Pre-	Special Training on Ethnic Minorities	Liberal Arts Involvement	Grade Level		Professional Level: Pre/InService		Participant Selection Procedure		Special public school-college cooperation	Community involvement	Scope			Project Status			Financing	
	Early	Extens.									Elem.	Second.	Pre-	In-	Volunteer	Selected			Limited	School-wide	Concluded	Current	In Planning		Amount	Source
12. Mountain View Center for Environmental Education, Boulder, Colorado									X	X				X	X						X				--	Ford Foundation
PUBLIC SCHOOL BASED PROGRAMS																										
13. Bell Junior High School Human Relations Master Plan					X	X						X		X	X			X		40		X			$ 15,000 (3 yrs)	CFK Ltd.
14. Centennial School District, San Luis--Urban-Rural Schools Program					--			--		--				--	--		--	--	--					--	25,000 (1 yr planning grant)	U.S.O.E.
15. Cherry Creek-U. of Colo. Teacher Education Program	X		X							X	X	X			X		X			27				X	333,000* (5 yrs)	U.S.O.E. Univ.-Dist.
16. Harrison School District, Colorado Springs--Diagnostic and Prescriptive Teaching					--					--				--	--		--				--			--	12,000 (1 yr. planning grant)	U.S.O.E.
17. Jefferson County School District--Secondary Education Institute						X						X		X	X		X			78		X			86,000	U.S.O.E. EPDA Grant
18. Jefferson County School District--Teacher Summer School Program					X	X				X	X			X	X		X			60			X		7,000	District
19. Leadville Public Schools Inservice Teacher Education						X				X	X			X	X						102	X			--	District
20. Pueblo City Schools (District 60)--BICAP--Bi-Cultural Appreciation Program						X		X		X	X			X	X		X	X			60		X		--	District College
21. Widefield School District, Security, Colorado--Individual Interest Profile Analysis Instruction					X					X	X			X	X		X				280 3 yr		X		60,000 (3 yrs) 9,000 (71-72)	U.S.O.E. Title III District

General Program Characteristics

Grade Level Emphasis. Although some of the newer programs include secondary education students, in the recent past there seems to have been more innovation in elementary preservice preparation than in secondary programs. Examples include the Teacher Corps programs, the Adams State-Los Alamos program, and the University of Colorado Individualized Teacher Education program at the University of Colorado at Boulder. Plans are under way at Adams State to reorganize the entire elementary education program around some of the ideas developed in the Los Alamos program. Reform in elementary education is easier, because often the program includes more required education courses, and because there is less need to gain cooperation from academic departments as a prerequisite for reform of the education program.

Selection and Screening of Students. There is a great deal of expressed concern for developing adequate screening procedures--both for selecting candidates and for dropping students from the programs when necessary. Little headway seems to be being made. Two approaches deserve consideration: requiring prior experience with children for admission to a program; using self-selection and counseling through a personalization program of the type developed at the University of Texas by Donald J. Veldman, called the Comprehensive Personal Assessment System for Teacher Education Programs.

College-Public School Cooperation. There is some interest in real integration between colleges and public schools to provide preservice training which uses personnel and facilities from colleges and schools to best advantage. The major examples of this approach are the Cherry Creek-University of Colorado and the Adams State-Los Alamos programs in which the school districts provide the facilities and personnel for major portions of college course work. In addition to cooperation in preservice education, Undergraduate Pre-Service Teacher Education Program, the University of Northern Colorado-Manual High School project and the two Teacher Corps programs include inservice training programs.

Community Involvement. Programs centered around preparation of teachers to work with children from ethnic minority groups all include community representatives in the policy-making aspects of the programs, and often in the implementation of the programs. How successful this community involvement is, we were unable to ascertain from the contacts we made. Outside these projects, there seems to be little direct use of community people in policy making or resource capacities.

Number of Students Affected. Most of the innovative programs are exper mental, limited to a small percentage of students. Exceptions are the Unive of Colorado Undergraduate Pre-Service Teacher Education Program and the Univ sity of Colorado Individualized Teacher Education pr gram at the same insti

Financing. Half of the programs have been financed through sizable fe grants: the Teacher Corps projects, the University of Northern Colorado-Manual High School program and the Undergraduate Pre-Service Teacher Educat Program. The other programs are the efforts of an individual or department operating with modest to no special funds. These people often find ingenio solutions to financing local projects. These low budget programs, while often highly desirable and effective, depend for their survival on the dedication of the innovators, and often of the students as well.

III. TRENDS IN TEACHER EDUCATION: SCHOOL-BASED INSERVICE PROGRAMS

Curriculum Innovations

The inservice programs surveyed represent a wide variety of models. T seems to be much more diversity here than in the innovative practices in pr service programs. Even though the formats of the programs differ, the gene objectives of inservice programs seem to focus on preparing teachers either to use strategies for individualizing student learning or to cope with children and the general teaching situation. The programs stress things li teacher accountability, humanizing the classroom, student-centered learning and shared responsibility in classroom and in school-wide decisions. In some of the interviews the individuals responsible for organizing these programs stressed the need for such training in the preservice education programs. To some extent these programs seem to represent on-the-job train to fill in the vital areas which were neglected in the teachers' undergradu college preparation for teaching.

Only two of the programs reported here stress training teachers to wor with children from ethnic minorities (the Centennial and Pueblo City School District programs). In general, such programs seem to be rare around the state--at least little known. Although only two programs are expressly designed to help teachers be more effective in working with children from ethnic minorities, others involve teachers working in relatively low income level communities (Widefield, for example).

General Program Characteristics

The following characteristics were apparent:

1) In all programs, teacher participants are volunteers. More than half of the programs are district-wide, and open to any teacher who is interested.

2) Most programs make use of college or university faculty. The Bi-Cultural Appreciation Program in Pueblo is operated from Southern Colorado State College. One interesting attempt at cooperation is being initiated at Bell Junior High School. There the administration has been trying to work out an arrangement with someuniversity which would allow Bell faculty to earn a Master of Arts degree based on course work designed to fit the specific needs of teachers working at Bell.

3) Except for the Bell Junior High School and the Pueblo Bi-Cultural Appreciation Program, community involvement does not seem to be a major thrust in the inservice programs.

4) Half of the programs are funded federally by the United States Office of Education and half are financed by the school districts. From the information available to us, budgets are modest.

IV. ISSUES AND QUESTIONS ABOUT INNOVATIONS IN TEACHER EDUCATION

The Preservice Curriculum

The TTT program emphasis is responding to the need for specially trained teachers to work with ethnic minorities. Undoubtedly there are specialized abilities that need to be acquired by members of the majority culture if they are to work with minority children, and there are special needs of members of minorities who are preparing to teach. But most of the innovative programs to prepare teachers to work with ethnic minorities include components which seem useful for all teachers--of minority and majority children alike:

- -- competency-based education;
- -- awareness training involving direct community experience;
- -- psychological training including group dynamics, communication skills and sensitivity training;
- -- learning to adjust the classroom to individual needs of students;
- -- learning to respond to community needs and to make use of community participation.

These issues or questions seem to arise from this line of thinking:

1. Can we agree upon a necessary basic set of learning outcomes which all teachers will acquire? That is, can we say what competencies or abilities all teachers should have? How does training to achieve these competencies compare with the core curricula now offered in teacher training institutions? What alternative curricula and organizational structures will support the development of these abilities in teachers?
2. Are the competencies required for teaching minority children universally useful so that all preservice programs should require them, or should teachers expecting to work with minority children have special training? Can we meet the overwhelming needs of minority children by training large numbers of minority teachers? What benefits would accrue to the whole teacher training process by the injection of much larger numbers of minority students?
3. What competencies derive out of the liberal arts portion of the undergraduate curriculum and can we gain cooperation between personnel in education and the other disciplines? What new opportunities for cooperation exist as a result of the changing values among college age students and young academics with strong drives toward public service? Are we taking advantage of these opportunities?

Optimum Use of the Education Labor Force.

It may have made sense at one time to separate inservice and preservice training, but colleges are now training teachers who can't find jobs while the teachers with the jobs are finding their responsibilities more and more onerous, their efforts less and less gratifying.

1. Do we need to reallocate existing training resources to permit more rapid adjustment of the supply of adequately trained teachers to the demand?
2. Can we muster enough force for change to break down the present inertia in teacher education so that we can temporarily shift training resources away from preservice into inservice education of teachers with all the institutional readjustments that this implies? What institutional readjustments does such a change imply?
3. Are there significant differences between the learning required of

teachers while in inservice training as compared to the learning outcomes in preservice training? What are the common competencies? Should they be the core of both kinds of programs? What are the unique aspects of pre- and inservice education of teachers?

4. Are there permanent structural changes required in our educational system which involve the merging of training resources into a common pool from which the schools, the community, the colleges and universities can draw? Should there be a merging of in- and preservice education, of teacher training resources from the teacher training institutions and the public schools? How can we make optimum use of our training resources?

Change Agents and External Financing

There are two different models apparent in the innovative programs described in our survey. Perhaps half of the programs have sizable financing through federal grants and they operate under the leadership of what might be called, for want of another term, professional change agents. The leaders and the programs are part of the grants economy in which federal funds are infused into the economy to foster rapid changes in institutions and/or our knowledge base in order to effect changes which will achieve high priority national goals.

The other half of the projects have been conceived and executed by individuals, sometimes by departments, financed modestly if at all by local sources, and organized around the priorities of the individual or school. We might call these the natural change agents, the inventors in teacher education. They would be innovating with or without federal or local funds. They are not primarily motivated by extrinsic reward; rather, they have some inner compulsion to make their classes or school work better. They are energetic, hard-driving people who do a job for its own sake, sometimes antagonizing and engendering jealousies on the part of colleagues in the process.

This distinction undoubtedly caricatures reality. I would hate to use it to categorize the individuals in this room, for instance. Nevertheless, it is useful because it emphasizes the need for both kinds of innovation and it suggests that these change agents have much to gain from mutual support. It is also important to recognize the harmful effects of competition between the "professional" and "natural" change agents--the possibility that the big projects may stifle or disadvantage the lone star.

This line of reasoning leads me to ask two final questions:

1. How do we identify talent and dedication to change? How do we reward it?
2. How can we maintain a balance which assures the continued development of large grants to effect basic structural changes in the education system, while still protecting and serving the inventors in our midst? How can the education establishment best use the talents of these special people?

CONFEREES REACTIONS TO THE TRENDS AND ISSUES PAPER

The preceding paper was intended to set the stage for discussion among conferees about their views of the important changes in teacher education occurring in Colorado as well as the appropriate directions future changes should take. The conferees divided into five groups of twenty to discuss the paper and to react to it by raising other pertinent issues. The groups were asked to generate a list of what they considered to be important issues related to innovation in teacher education in Colorado, and rank the issues in order of importance. The output of each group was reproduced and distributed later in the day. The content of the discussions, reported below, was taken from the small group reports.

Group discussions seemed to center around seven general topics:

1) the identification of teacher competencies;
2) the need for cooperation between various groups involved in teacher education;
3) problems of selection and retention of teachers;
4) financial and economic problems;
5) strategies for restructuring teacher education;
6) methods of creating effective school-community cooperation;
7) basic values and goals of education.

Competencies and Qualities of Effective Teachers

By far the most discussed set of issues related to the need to identify the characteristics which define an effective teacher. Most of these discussions focused on the identification of competencies and the organization of pre- and inservice teacher education around teacher acquisition of these competencies.

Reports from all but one group emphasized this topic. One group ranked "performance, effectiveness, accountability" as the main issue with which educators must cope. Questions of the following sort were raised by the groups: How do we share information on identifying competencies and criteria? How do we measure achievement of competencies? Can we narrow down the range of professional competencies enough to make competency-based teacher training work?

There was some agreement that competencies or attributes of effective teaching should be the basis for restructuring both pre- and inservice teacher education and that both pre- and inservice teacher education should be directed toward the achievement of the same kinds of teacher performance. The groups identified a list of desirable competencies or qualities for a teacher:

a) culturally aware

b) possesses knowledge of self

c) engages in critical thinking

d) allows students to share decision-making responsibilities

e) encourages students to identify and express their personal learning needs

f) independent--values independence in self and others and independence in thought and action

g) flexible

h) dedicated to individual student learning needs

i) able to lead

j) effective in management of punishment

k) competent in subject matter

l) competent in using educational media resources

m) able to plan effectively

n) able to diagnose and prescribe

o) able to manage a learning environment much richer and wider than that which exists in the ordinary classroom

p) able to use the child's experiences and values as the point of departure to develop analytic and problem-solving skills

q) possesses interpersonal problem-solving skills

r) possesses group process skills

s) knowledgable about innovations in education

t) innovative

u) intellectually curious

The diversity of what were considered important qualities and competencies gives some indication of the problems involved in trying to reach a consensus on the criteria for constructing teacher education curricula and for evaluating teacher performance.

Cooperation between Agencies Involved in Teacher Education

This was another common focus of discussion, as all five groups listed items related to this general topic. The need for cooperation was expressed in terms of the need for more communication between the public schools and colleges, between all education agencies and the community, between the schools of education and the academic faculty in colleges and universities. This need was also expressed in the concern for more direct interaction between colleges and public schools in the development of a realistic partnership to create effective teacher training programs. Some of the questions raised indicate the concerns:

Can new, cooperative agency interactions yield improved teacher training?

How can we get public schools involved in teacher education?

How can we get more training of teachers within the public school classrooms?

How can we institutionalize change so it is continuous, and what is the capacity of people and educational institutions to change?

What should be the role of teacher training agencies in teacher education?

How can we close the gap between schools of education and academic departments?

How can we promote communication between different educational institutions and the community?

Selection and Retention of Teachers

All groups listed issues related to selection and retention. Their discussions of this issue ranged from problems of selecting and evaluating undergraduates in preservice teacher education to problems of tenure of experienced teachers.

The issue of selection and retention relates directly to discussions of the need for identification of competencies, for techniques which could help teachers gain these competencies, and for providing administrators with effective criteria for teacher evaluation.

The specific issues raised included the following:

How do we screen potential teachers to select them for entrance into preservice training and to qualify them for a teaching certificate?

How can tenure regulations be revised to protect teachers and at the same time provide schools with some flexibility in staffing?

Can there be alternative certification routes?

Do certification and college accreditation requirements inhibit experimentation?

Should certification requirements be tied to teacher acquisition of competencies?

Strategies for Restructuring Teacher Education

One group addressed itself specifically to the identification of ways of restructuring teacher education. They made several suggestions: 1) direct more resources to preservice education; the current surplus of teachers is healthy in weeding out people who are less talented; 2) recruit more minority people into the teaching profession; 3) review and revise the types and amount of teacher supervision; 4) encourage specialization among college programs to optimize the use of teacher training resources; 5) thoroughly review the sequencing of training experiences in the preservice education program; 6) develop a continuum between pre- and inservice education; 7) develop programs which get away from the mass production of teachers.

Financial and Economic Problems in Teacher Education

Three groups listed the following items related to financing teacher education and coping with the current economic conditions in education:

How can we reallocate the existing funds going into education?

How can we reorder the priorities in the educational establishment to secure a more effective financial base?

How can we influence Federal financing policy?

How can we work towards more cooperative financing among the various possible sources?

How can we cope with the fact that education is no longer a growth industry or sector of the economy?

School-Community Involvement

Two groups discussed these issues related to school-community cooperation: 1) the need for greater involvement of schools and community in pre- and inservice education; 2) the possible effectiveness of smaller, autonomous school districts to encourage more community involvement; 3) the need for effective community involvement at both the classroom, school, and school district levels of organization; 4) the need for effective communication

about education between children, parents, and educators.

Basic Goals of Education

All groups recognized that the improvement of teacher education is intimately tied to community attitudes about the worth of education and the effectiveness of the schools in providing good education for children. This raises questions for general discussion among educators and the consumers of education such as:

What is school for?

How do we make the school experience relevant?

Who should determine educational goals and policies?

PART TWO

Evening Session

Sunday, August 1, 1971

INTRODUCTION OF DONALD N. BIGELOW

by M. C. Davis

I think we should move rather quickly into our purpose for the evening. Don Bigelow is Director, Division of College Programs, U.S. Office of Education. As I thought in terms of introducing him, there were two people who came to my mind. I want to tell you a little about them, as Don prepares to come forward. One was Victor Hugo, and the other was Frederick Douglass.

I think these are the words of Victor Hugo: "Greater than the tread of mighty armies is the power of an idea whose time has arrived." You have heard that, you have read it. Long before Don Bigelow sired the TTT program through the Office of Education, he and many other educators were disturbed, to put it mildly, about the inability of the products of our teacher education institutions to relate effectively to and beneficially for particularly the inner-city, ethnic-minority learner and his community. Dr. Bigelow, in addition to being a concerned, perceptive, aggressive, and visionary educator, must too have known the profound words of Frederick Douglass, when this runaway slave orator said, "Those who profess to favor freedom, and yet deprecate agitation, are men who want crops without plowing the ground. They want rain without thunder and lightning. They want the ocean without the awesome roar of its mighty waters."

And so it seems to me that this is why we are here, this is what it's all about. I'm very confident that you will think long on what this man has to say about the agitation that educators must initiate, and continue, in this powerful idea whose time has arrived--the idea of changing our societies, changing the full range of our educational institutions. I'm sure that as some of you have heard before, since one of the roles of a teacher is to participate in liberation, we shall hear from Don Bigelow some ideas that we in Colorado can take for participating in liberation. Don...

FREEDOM, PROCESS, AND COLORADO

by Donald N. Bigelow

Well, that was probably one of the nicest introductions I have ever had, and I thank you for it, Moses.

There are many ways I would like to begin tonight and one is to say that I don't believe I'm as confused as I'm going to sound. There is a kind of mixture of things in my head that I want to say and I cannot unmix them. I'm not going to try. To do so would be to spoil something. The fact is that something is at work here among us tonight, something is going for us that I haven't quite put my speaking finger on, not to be confused with a green thumb! I'd like to reach out and touch it. So, instead, I'm going to try to speak to "it" hoping that I won't spoil what I'm trying to touch. While I may be asking you to try to understand me, I'm not expecting your approval.

First, let me say that I did not come here to talk about the demise of the TTT program which, as the present directive has it, will occur during Fiscal Year 1973. But I cannot pretend to be happy with the decision either. Nor did I come here to talk about how good we have been, or where we are going. So we will leave it at that. Notwithstanding, TTT does have a kind of rhythm to it--doesn't it?--and it is something which I cannot ignore, nor can you. In fact, it is the high mountain air of Colorado and I am sure that I can smell it. Finally, I've agreed that, since we have all had such a long time to eat and to recover from the day, that I may be more useful to you if I speak more briefly than scheduled, and if you agree that you'll share equal time, that is, you'll ask questions. If you respond to my challenge, I believe you'll get more out of your questions and my replies than otherwise.

It is quite clear that we are all concerned with something called education. And it's quite clear that only in individual instances, and sporadically, is anything really being done about it. Like good intentions, we keep paving the way but never getting there. Notwithstanding my cynicism, I think the record would show, say, that today 95% of the schools are just as bad as they ever were, and almost all of the colleges are the same. That's a 5% victory for the schools, which is not too much. Zero for higher education. You may disagree with me, but let's not quibble--add any number to my estimated percentage that you want. I cannot believe that you would be here unless you agreed more, rather than less, with my exaggerated notions. So, while what

has been done may have made some difference, it is not much of a difference, and I think we may all agree that it has not made the difference. I assume that you are here because you believe that there must be something we can do. Now, although I don't have the answer, I'd like to make a local try at it. Let me divide my comments into three parts. 1) I would like to talk about the word "Colorado," which happens to be the name of a state; 2) I would like to talk about the word "process," which happens to be, like relevance, a new word we use and abuse, but which nevertheless has meaning; and finally 3) I would like to talk about the word "freedom," which of course, has been abused mightily. I'll talk about them in reverse order for the 27 minutes that are left.

So much has been said about freedom that it seems unnecessary to say more. And yet, what with cultural pluralism vying with motherhood under the guise of democracy, there is the need for some definition. While I can't provide the definitive definition, I can talk about the problem of freedom within today's framework of participatory democracy. I guess we all have our own examples of what it is. My particular example would be this: all of us are concerned with teaching--I might even have called this speech tonight, "Free to Teach, Free to Learn." Now, we all know what a teacher is because we have all had more than one, suffered one, or been one. And I'm mightily concerned about teachers and freedom because, as we look around us, we find that we are all seeing things in terms of absolutes. Perhaps that's part of the age; perhaps it's necessary. But I get the sense that we are fighting for freedom a little too hard, if only because we've already got it.

For the next seven minutes I want to talk about freedom in these terms: when we talk about freedom we must consider the paradox of a great democracy which is essentially a closed society. Now this is a matter of degree and definition since, of course, you might say, "Well, look at Russia," (about which we know very little)--but let's look at Russia. Perhaps the Russians don't have the openness which we think we have; perhaps they are not as free as we are. I'm not sure, but I would guess so. Let's say so--middle-America does, and silent-America does, so let me echo them. The fact is the image is there. On the other hand, freedom is something very personal not to be confused with Russia, and we could say, "Yes, we have openness, we can talk freely And that's true. But, here, I would like to elaborate.

Traditionally, the teacher has been supreme in his classroom. He can, as one of my professors did, lock the door. But even if he doesn't lock the door,

the door is essentially locked. What takes place inside that classroom is between the teacher and the class. By the way, I sound as if I were talking about something in the past. Of course, I'm not; it still operates that way today, and one doesn't think of it as something out of the past. The fact is, of course, that it was originally a great step toward freedom if indeed, the teacher could get behind locked, or metaphorically locked, classroom doors and therefore be free to speak merely by keeping anyone else out. In the same vein, we have developed a feeling toward tenure, which also provided for freedom. Tenure was a way to prevent the politicians and the people from jeopardizing the freedom of man's thinking--the Platonic, the 18th-century scholar, the Emersonian. It's true. I don't want to overemphasize the matter but the fact is, originally, for whatever reasons, locking the school door and granting tenure were ways to insure freedom in education. You may say, "Well, it was a lousy way," but in deference to history (which doesn't have much currency these days), I ask you to consider it in the context of another day when what happened, was better, i.e., was freer, more "open" if you will, by virtue of locking the door or having tenure.

Now today, both of these are in question. And in the school room--and when I talk about school room, I include college classrooms as well as public school rooms, K-12--we now know that there are ways of challenging that teacher, of getting things said that weren't said before, and of talking about a system that is more open, simply by breaking into that classroom. The earlier system no longer works. One can argue that what is happening today is different, as I do, i.e., that what happened before occurred because it protected freedom then, but it no longer does. What I am suggesting when I say that tenure should go, and when I applaud teacher aides, youth teaching youth, team teaching, breaking down classroom walls--no matter what you want to call it--these are efforts at a freedom for today. Not a better freedom, and not the final freedom, but today's freedom.

The school buildings themselves are citadels rooted in the past, out of the medieval days of Camelot. (Who has not been to such a school that does not today, alas, defend their existence?) They were by definition expected to be separated from the community, and lo, how successful they were. One does not have to be a historian to explain it. One has to understand that there were years, no, centuries, when people had no common school and, therefore, when we had a common school it had to be protected from the community. So we

built fortresses. That we continue to build them, largely, is because architects are architects and don't know any better, though we know that a change has occurred--replete with glass walls. The fact is today's sense of "open" versus "closed" is what we mean by freedom.

But was yesterday's freedom wrong? Well, we seem to think so. I'm saying, please, let us understand the word I'm soon to get to--process--and not disturb the sense of some fair historical judgments. Believe me the fortress was a place where the teacher could "do his thing" long before the phrase was coined. Now, I don't want to bore you with a discussion of open schools in terms of open architecture, in terms of school parks, and I don't mean to extol them here. I only want to say, aren't they a beautiful example of what we're talking about? But does this mean that they offer more freedom than we had in the past? The answer of course is clear--it means more freedom for more people than in the past. You see I'm quite willing, with Illich, a wonderful man, a great diagnostician of what is wrong--I'm not sure what we are going to do about it, in his terms--to accept the fact that schooling is bad. We know that because it makes us all feel guilty.

Now to go back into history to Jacob Riis. There it would seem is the real villain; nevertheless he recognized cultural pluralism before the first cultural pluralist ever came down the pike. And not only that, he came up with a damn good answer. Because if he hadn't done what he did, like Horace Mann before him, fewer people would have had an education, and fewer of us today would be arguing about education here and now. Sure, he talked about the "melting pot." Sure, he said forget your damn language and your lousy foreign ways, shape up or ship out, be an American, and the word was Americanization. Utterly revolting today. But what was he doing? He was saying, this is how you get the vote, and if you want to give up something for the vote, which is a part of your right, learn the language. Now this may sound silly for me to say, but it isn't you know, because I don't think Jacob Riis would sell anyting today and neither do you. But I think we can only profit from cultural pluralism's hopes by understanding an earlier version of a nation's efforts to save its culturally pluralistic society. Okay, you're thinking, next he'll be defending the robber barons. Well, I might. But I certainly will defend Lincoln, and yet you know when Lincoln gave his speeches in Chicago, he was an abolitionist, but when he was down in Cairo, it was another story. Read his speeches.

Now, my point is not that freedom is relative, nor absolute, but rather that freedom must be viewed within its environmental conditions. But, in seeking the new level of freedom, we tend to make it absolute, and unrelated to the past. Freedom, it seems to me, is nothing new, and the beauty of our system, which I'm not here to defend, is that we can find new ways to use our freedom. I am here to make this point: before we decide how the new Jacob Riis should interpret our society--which we haven't yet defined and which still looks largely like a synonym for democracy--let's look at what we are doing to individual freedom in the process. How much are we going to take away from our freedom while we fight for new freedom? Now in case anyone missed me, I'm for the teacher who can't lock doors, I'm against tenure, I really like rugs on the floor, I don't like glass walls because it's hot (and it doesn't look out over anything, which is the whole purpose of windows), I like open schooling, and I am for cultural pluralism; but I'm not so gung ho for all of it that I want to lose sight of the fact that this indeed also is but prologue. And if we think, as I think often we do, that applying what we are learning to education and to freedom is the final setp, we are going to miss the rights of too many people in the process. Take the instance of Black Studies and how we sold too many people down the road, too quickly. By the way, nothing is wrong with Black Studies; but, man, there is nothing right with White Studies. So let's look in the right direction. I'm suggesting that change comes from looking to the future and to the past, not just from having a feeling for the present.

Process? I've already illustrated it. We like the word, which means we are not authoritarian. We like the word, which means we must fight hierarchies. We like the word because we are not fascists. We understand the word because, like my understanding of that new word "confrontation," that's the way to get to speak to each other. And if you can't learn how to speak the new language, get out of the kitchen. The process is working. I think it is even more at work because more people are involved today, more using their basic rights--rights built on our past efforts--than ever before. But the dangers are greater. And the dangers of losing opportunities, the danger of losing the individual right even to be a WASP, like me, increase daily, if we move in the direction of freedom for every latest fad. And I'm here to defend, not the WASP, but the right of individuals.

I want to now put all this in terms of Colorado. "Process" is the magic word for cooperation in terms of looking at the problem. We're now talking about a process of amalgamation. That process means we have to learn not how to theorize and to lecture, but to talk about and to confront. In that process, and now I make the major point of the evening, I think we have to recognize that, just as in the French Revolution, there was a time for consolidation. I don't mean peace, I don't mean giving up, I mean consolidation.

Let me see if I can explain that in the seven minutes remaining. It is quite clear to most of us here, if I understand the temper of this group (I may not, but let it be my hope for the evening that I do), that there is a consensus that the governor and the legislature and the community can't do it alone. It's nice to say, as I said at the infamous Hawaiian seminars four years ago, that the individual state has got to work with higher education, it's got to work with the schools, it has got to work with the communities. It's nice to say that. But, I think that probably very few people really want such cooperative efforts, if only because somebody would have to give up too much power if that were to occur. So I ask you to look at how far we have gone toward an open community, and what of the new freedom to move in that direction.

If I understand TTT, if I understand many of you, we are no longer talking about the tribes of yesteryear, we are talking about the detribalized program of tomorrow. It's no longer, Larry Senesh tells me, just economics, but political science and economics. Well, he's come a long way. Someday we'll get him a little further, but the point is, the direction has changed. Imagine him saying it ten years ago--I know he probably did, but allow me my symbols! Who introduced me? It isn't that he is not a white man, nor that he is a black man, but that he is a man who has been involved in state activities. Imagine that occurring along with Larry Senesh, ten years ago. Impossible! Imagine our having met and had this much concern for this problem ten years ago. Equally impossible!

Now what's possible? Not so much. We are at a general stalemate condition. We are thinking too much of Indians, of Blacks, of poor people. And we are not talking enough about poor whites, bad suburbs, and of Indians, Blacks, and the poor. We're thinking too much of our discomfort; we're not thinking half enough of more discomfort. And what we are really not talking about is how

to get the power from the state to make the difference. Now, I cannot come from Washington to tell you in Colorado what to do in your state. But I am saying most of you have learned that you can no longer go your own way. Most of you have already gone the route of team teaching or pulling a minority person into the school system. Bully! Most of you have tried to do something about the curriculum, perhaps to have been swallowed up by that greatest of all swamps. And others of you have done something about the school, the community, and the college only to learn that the college isn't listening and doesn't want to. Now, what do you do? There is no panacea. Yet you could do things about teacher training if you wanted. You could talk about teacher training as though it were basic to survival rather than a peripheral affair like painting the fender red on a car that is going to the moon--which is surely not very important, no matter how colorful. The simple fact is, we haven't begun, as a group, to learn what the community has been trying to tell us--who's got the power and what is the direction we want to go to use it. Instead, we come together, as tonight, each with our own vestige of power, and each with our own desire to keep it. Thank you.

DAVIS: If there is one thing which I got out of what Dr. Bigelow presented, it would probably be summarized in these words: "I dare you." And so, to continue that "I dare you" point, Don has said he will give us "equal time." I would like for him to come back here to the hot spot and I'd like for us to make it hot. Let's fire some questions to him, to help us clarify for ourselves our real purpose for being here.

QUESTION-ANSWER PERIOD

HAMILTON: Obviously you're an optimist, from what you said.

BIGELOW: I wouldn't have come here otherwise.

HAMILTON: What makes you think that the forces of adequate change are going to be adequate to change?

BIGELOW: First, as I said earlier, I think it would have been impossible a decade ago to say that you could align any school with any community, which, if I understand it correctly, are the bitterest of enemies. Secondly, I would expect that ten years ago to talk about the production of teachers as something

to be done only when the community and the school had an input with the university--which meant not only teacher education but the liberal arts--would have been as ridiculous as it sounds now, because we are not very far, but we are farther than we were ten years ago when we were almost nowhere. So as a basis for my optimism, I would say that, quite aside from the activities of the federal government or the contribution of the foundations, and mostly as a result of the Supreme Court desegregation decision of 1954, with all of its resulting trials and tribulations, something has happened which I could only describe in favorable terms. The last 17 years warranted my optimism if we take advantage of them.

HAMILTON: I think you have missed my question. It deals basically with the rate of change, not with whether we're going to change. Obviously things are going to change, but obviously ten years ago we weren't on the moon. And things are changing much more rapidly, or at least the problems are increasing or they are different, and I think we need forces to meet these challenges.

BIGELOW: So why is the rate of change of the last 15 years sufficient to make me think that the rate of change in the next 15 years will be adequate? Well, first, I think we have come to a new level of sophistication within the framework of learning. There were times when what Frank Brown said, or what Dwight Allen said, or what some other interesting person said, seemed to be the end all of the solutions to American education--modular scheduling, team teaching, the use of technology--well, the list is long, I really don't want to get involved. But we believed it. I think almost everybody knows now, that asking a question on the other side of the hill was one way to get out of our little empires. But it seems to me that the next man to come with a misformed notion of what to do with television, and calls it microteaching so that nobody knows what he means at all, will get booed out of court.

Secondly, I think we've all come to realize that the federal government can't do it all. That's why I said Colorado can make a difference, just as North Dakota is making a difference, and just as, for quite different reasons, I think Texas is making a difference. When something goes on in a region large enough to be effective and small enough to be dealt with, there will be a difference.

SENESH: Dr. Bigelow, I really think that your observation, that American institutions, today as ever, depend upon the community and that communities are frugal to make changes, is good. When comparing the American institutions with

the European, one indeed can say that the European institutions always have been able (I'm not saying this as an approval of that system) to make themselves independent from the community. The town-and-gown relationship just simply didn't exist in Europe. It was a kind of aristocratic institution, because it paid a high price for making education exclusive for the more financially well-to-do and the talented. Now in America, you have a very exciting relationship of town and gown. Unfortunately, there is very little dialogue between town and gown, mainly when it comes to the institutions of higher learning. Here there is no communication between the faculty and the state legislature, who are the representatives of the people. As a matter of fact, the state legislature is not even interested in the opinions of university faculties. When the students revolt on campus and demand "relevant" education, the state legislature takes it out on the faculty, rather than entering into dialogue with the faculty on how to bring such reforms about.

Many faculty members are searching for educational relevance and innovations. Many receive grants from the U.S. government to experiment. But the minute the government grants stop, the innovative experiment fades away, because the state does not allocate funds which would enable the university to continue the innovative project.

Since we have today in the audience members of the state legislature, I think the question that I am asking you, from them, is: what mechanism could be established which would guarantee the continuation of the many innovations which have been launched by university people with the help of the federal grants?

BIGELOW: I think that's a fair description of what's happening throughout the United States. We hear that Reagan does it and did it, but even if true, he can't really cause others to do it, but they seem to be doing it too! And I've been in the states of Michigan, Illinois, and California, where just what was described has happened. The governor doesn't really cause it to happen; the state legislators cause it to happen. They cause it to happen and they are elected by you and me presumably. (Well, I live in Washington, and I elect almost nobody, but the rest of you do.) Let me say, therefore, I agree with your premise. If I get a question out of it, it is, "What shall we do about it?"

Let me give you two quite different answers: I honestly believe that we now know that federal aid to education will never mean federal control of

education. I think that the federal government can help overcome the, let me say, disingenuity of the state legislators and their lack of experience by offering a quid pro quo to save institutions of higher education and to provide further help with the schools. That, I think, is one answer to your question, Larry, and I think it has to be considered seriously because, what do you do with state legislators when they support people like Mr. Reagan? What do you do with those who support this governor in Illinois, where the same thing appears to be happening, for whatever reasons?

Now, the second answer. We've got to educate the state legislators, and if people like those represented here would go seriously about their education, the way a lot of people have gone at my education, which I've appreciated and gained from, it would be different. It's an amazing fact, isn't it, that the few things we have in common are what we do sexually, one way or another, generally together, paying taxes, and education. And yet those things are seldom high on any list at the time of an election.

To recapitulate, I think there are two alternatives. One is to look more and more to the federal government; or eschewing that (for good reasons which we all share, because nobody wants somebody in Washington telling us what to do), then we've got to find a way of saying that we must have those taxes to help the kids.

STIEGHORST: It seems that your earlier classical description of academic freedom and the changes that are taking place in this freedom could also be interpreted as a shift in freedom from the teacher to the student--from Lehrfreiheit to Lehrnfreiheit. Now in formulating some kind of strategy or implementing this greater freedom of the student to learn, are there even greater political problems of the constituencies with which you deal in terms of students in contrast to the persons of which you just spoke?

BIGELOW: I am personally convinced that learning is the latest fad. I actually believe that whatever we call the teacher of tomorrow--I like to think of the teacher as a consultant to the student--the teacher is central. It's not because I want to preserve schooling; it's not because I want to preserve your jobs; it's merely because, as I observe kids as human beings, there must be an intermediary for them. We used to call them teachers, and I don't care what you call them tomorrow. They will be blended with all the specialists of today into the teacher-consultant. If we took all the school conselors, 38,000 strong, and put them in the Pacific Ocean, the salt wouldn't even

change, and we'd never miss them. There's no one who has ever been in a school who doesn't know that's true, because all they are doing is talking about motherhood or brotherhood, but nothing to do with the big issues. The point is, every time we talk about learning, we somehow come up with another specialist to make it better, so in terms of my sense of strategy, let's talk about teaching--time-worn, shop-worn, goofy teaching--but you can't get rid of it, so let's deal with it before we get to Illich. On the one hand, I can't asnwer you about learning without showing my bias. Now, on the other hand, we've learned that in most classes the teacher does all the work and all the talking, and there's no learning that takes place. What we are also learning is that nobody ever will know how to measure when it does take place. And we are going to die on that vine unless we realize that we've got to deal with somebody who's accountable--that's a teacher, it seems to me--and not in terms of learning, but in terms of the student. And we can't expect a society that has been poorly educated to somehow have teachers who are less than poorly educated. The reason there are so many bad teachers, of course, is that they have had so many good models. The point is we have turned to learning instead of talking about what we are doing wrong. Not that we don't also have to talk about learning, which we haven't talked about before either.

HAMILTON: If we have trouble getting our constituencies to understand and accept the fact that even a poor teacher is a part of the system, how are we going to make out when we try to put more responsibility on the learner? When he goes home isn't this politically more devastating?

BIGELOW: Well, there's one way to look at it, it couldn't be any worse than it is now.

HAMILTON: But that's now...

BIGELOW: But it's a beginning. It allows you greater freedom. Now, we could talk about inservice training but generally speaking that's like asking the pigeons in Central Park to clean up their own mess; there has to be a beginning, and it isn't going around wiping the stuff off of the statues. And that's what we spend our time doing. At some point, if we are going to talk in an abstract way about learning, we must talk about how to get at the system where somebody's learning something. Now we used to think--and the federal government and the Congress passed a lot of legislation on the assumption--that the way to do it was through graduate education. Well, that was a mistake. You might just as

well try to take Camelot with a spear. The fact is that the best organized group in the world are these professionals, the sacred dragons who guard the disciplines. They come to Washington in droves, and get money to do what they have always done. And you can't stop that any more than you can the Mississippi from overflooding its banks. It seems to me that we have learned that lesson. They have power and they're not giving it up, and it's the power of a professional. So it seems to me just as we should give up inservice as ineffective, we should abandon our efforts to change the graduate school, because those efforts really are just spinning our wheels.

The time has come to get to where the real problem is--undergraduate education. We've got to consider that system which continues to produce 200,000 preservice teachers a year. And to do that, we've got to decide which comes first--education or the education of teachers. And surely, even in the day of the community, education must come before the education of teachers. And by the way, it's the community that's going to say that in the next ten years. They're worried about education, thank God, which the community of the last thirty years hasn't been. What we've really got to do, it seems to me, is talk about how undergraduate education works versus a career, or versus professionalism.

TOMLINSON: Don, what I hear you saying is the opposite of what TTT is all about. Because to me, TTT was concerned with training people who were involved in training teachers.

BIGELOW: That, by the way, is what it means to me.

TOMLINSON: Well, I'd like to hear you talk about that, because I think it's pretty important.

BIGELOW: Well, you'll recall my earlier caveat that I didn't want to for a variety of reasons, particularly since it's just been put out of business and I'm not here to complain.

TOMLINSON: Why have the folks in the U.S. Office of Education changed in terms of teacher education? What was the rationale behind that?

BIGELOW: I can't answer that question because I don't know it. Let me try to put it this way. The TTT, as many of you know, has at least this notion, that until the consumers, which are the communities in which we find the kids--and that's not just any black, white, or other color community, it's parents with kids--until they and the schools have a say in the production of teachers,

teacher training will continue as it has, inconsequentially to what is needed. To achieve that combination we have parity, which said, in effect, that until the community and the school and the liberal arts and the so-called teacher education group (which really doesn't have much to do with teacher education, but has monopolized the situation and created a mythology so we believe it to be true) get together, we are not going to be able to produce 200,000 adequately trained teachers each year. Until we talk about the educated man, until we release the dynamic, creative energy that makes a difference, it won't matter. That energy has to come from the resources which are locked up in our universities, combined with those which the schools have, too--in terms of parity, with equality. Now, if schools can do this without a college, there should be no man in the country to stop them. I know of very few school superintendents, however, after two years of experimenting with it, who now think a school can become a training center. So, therefore, any effort that strives for less than the general notions of TTT is, it seems to me, doomed.

S. HELBURN: It seemed to me in travelling around the state that one of the solutions to the problems is to count on individuals and to get them together. It really has nothing to do with the institutions at all, but simply getting the dynamos to know each other and to form some sort of critical mass.

BIGELOW: A sophisticated form of a cocktail party...

S. HELBURN: Except that they aren't going to be drinking all the time.

BIGELOW: Oh, no, you're too literal, you must be a purist. What you are really saying is how do you convert that?

S. HELBURN: Right. How do you do that?

BIGELOW: Well, that's your job, Sue. Judging from the list you showed me today, there's enough federal money here to get some results.

ARRIETA: I enjoyed your speech except for one...

BIGELOW: No, no, don't flatter me, what do you want to say?

ARRIETA: When you talked aouut Americanization, amalgamation, consolidation, detribalization, a question came to my mind. What makes you think that members of the dominant culture have the right or knowledge for the detribalization of blacks, browns, or red people, all in the name of education? This, I hope you'll look at as a philosophical and moral question.

BIGELOW: Are you saying to me, that somehow I implied or suggested that we can take the heat off now, everything is copacetic, and everybody will get their rights? Is that what you are saying?

ARRIETA: Yes.

BIGELOW: Well I don't believe that for a moment, so I'm glad you pinned me down on this. I didn't mean to suggest that we had reached the point where the pressure can be less. I was only trying to suggest that while the pressure is on, can't we also begin to amalgamate? As I noted earlier, 1954 marked the resurgence into our society of what I would call the new democracy. The effort by no means is over, and the pressure must be kept up at every point. I was trying to suggest, however, that we ought to keep that pressure up as much as we do with our children, while also understanding--the image is bad--there's got to be some forgiveness at the same time. That's what I was asking for. Now, I don't know how to do that. I don't know that you know how to do that, but I think our society has to learn how to do that, otherwise my freedom will go down the drain along with others, and that's what I was examining. Did I at least reach your question?

ARRIETA: Vaguely.

BIGELOW: Do you want to ask a part of it again another way? Because I'm not trying to turn this very important question off, by any device that I know.

ARRIETA: Well, my interpretation of what you were saying was that amalgamation is deemphasized and through the educational process this detribalization is going to take place, and can't you educate the dumb ignorant people's beliefs and way of life away?

BIGELOW: You mean, can we educate without taking their way of life away?

ARRIETA: Right.

BIGELOW: Well, I think I have to say, no, we can't. But let me go back to Jacob Riis. I was suggesting that Jacob Riis's "melting pot" theory, which is now thoroughly discredited and properly so, was not in his day a discreditable notion. That may have only passing interest, but to me it was important to make this point. Jacob Riis and the melting pot is gone; racism persists. I was suggesting that we have some opportunity to begin constructing something to help deal with that.

HAMILTON: I want to ask something about students and the eighteen-year-old vote. If students are allowed to vote on campus, and therefore to have a viable student power, what influence do you think this will have on the whole of education?

BIGELOW: It could be deleterious beyond recall. Or, it could be--the fact is, may be--the next effort to try to get some sanity in the eyes of those who don't understand that problem at all. Let me put it this way. Not enough has been done for students' rights, I feel. I'd like to see a lot more done. I once gave a speech, now written in a book--I'll advertise it--called The Liberal Arts and Teacher Education: A Confrontation. The speech was called "The Fourth Revolution," and I said in essence that students are going to make, have already given us the chance to make, the next change in American education. So, I'm trying to say, they should continue. But, unhappily, I fear that they've already begun to cease and desist.

DAVIS: I think I'm going to assume a little prerogative here and ask the last question. I'm wondering if this is putting you too much on the spot. This question has been asked before in another way, but I want to ask it again. You've had a chance to take a hard look at the mixture of responsibilities represented in this conference, and you of course know the ideas that were behind the initiating of the TTT program nationally. You know the concerns this group has for trying to discover what directions we in Colorado should move in order to be a little more realistic and a little more effective in teacher education and teacher preparation, preservice and inservice. As a visionary, what do you see for this assemblage of responsibilities for what we are looking for in going beyond this point of TTT?

BIGELOW: Well, that's not a loaded questions, that's just a hard one, and thank you for it. Colorado has amazing resources in money and imagination. But in talking about the theory of parity, which is the basis of TTT, and which I think is a fair one, a viable one, we've got to talk about power; we have to talk about power openly. And in talking about power, we've got to divide the systems that hold the power together, one against the other. It is clear--as the French Revolution showed us, as did the Russian, as did the Chinese--that power to the people very seldom changes and reforms institutions, which make the difference. History is replete with that fundamental, basic conclusion, which is not anti-revolution; it's merely to say that institutional reform must be a very careful attempt over a period of time to produce a difference. Our own agricultural exercise indicates that we can provide institutional reform in this country. What has happened in England in the last 30 years, I think, indicates institutional reform. What I'm trying to suggest is that until a state faces up to the people and provides leadership, it will probably continue to

have individual resources, entrepreneurially gotten at, with indifferent successes that will never make any impact.

PART THREE

Morning and Afternoon Sessions

Monday, August 2, 1971

Project Communi-Link, Colorado State University, Ft. Collins, Colorado

John C. Snider Herbert Manig

Project Communi-Link, funded by the U.S. Office of Education, is designed to involve community persons in the decision-making process in adult education. John Snider has developed a simulation game called "Microville" which involves participants in a special intercommunication experience. Participants who attended this session were asked to participate in the simulation.

University of Northern Colorado/Manual High School Project, Greeley, Colorado

Donald M. Luketich
Harry T. Waters
Thomas E. Boyle
Mary Coen
Robert D. Hall
Christine Alvarez
Leo Benn

The University of Northern Colorado/Manual High School Project is designed to improve education at Manual High School and to design a relevant teacher education program at the University of Northern Colorado. Program staff, representatives of the School of Arts and Sciences, community representatives, and students from the University of Northern Colorado and Manual High School discussed the program and their role as participants.

Teacher Training Experience for Inner City Schools, University of Northern Colorado, Greeley, Colorado

Sorl Shead
Carrie Shead
Loren Watson
Mary Lou Watson
Maureen Lancaster
Bill Mitchell

Roy Krosky of the University of Northern Colorado has designed and implemented a program to help prepare preservice teachers for service in inner-city schools. As one phase of this experience, students live in the community with a family whose life style is significantly different from that of the student. Mr. and Mrs. Shead and Mr. and Mrs. Watson participated in the program as host families; Maureen Lancaster and Bill Mitchell were student participants. They discussed their participation in the program.

Teacher Corps, Southern Colorado State College, Pueblo, Colorado

Antonio Esquibel
Joel Gonzales
Robert Arrieta
Jesus Greer

The cross-cultural coordinator and three interns from the program described the goals and program of the Southern Colorado State College Teacher Corps. Community-based education, competency-based objectives, and cross-cultural understanding are among the components of the program which were discussed.

NEW PROGRAMS IN TEACHER EDUCATION IN COLORADO

The following programs were presented on Monday, August 2. Participants had the opportunity to hear three presentations.

University-Based Programs

Cooperative Teacher Education Program, Adams State College/Los Alamos Public Schools

Hazel V. Craker
Magdalene Singer
Barbara Fuller
Debbie Karr

Hazel Craker, Coordinator, two instructor-teachers, and a participating student talked about their roles in the program. The major objectives of this innovative preservice teacher education program include the blending of methods courses with student teaching and the utilization of public school personnel in elementary teacher education.

Competency-Based Teacher Education, Adams State College, Alamosa, Colorado

Lawrence T. Gomez
John Roybal

The Teacher Corps at Adams State is funded by the U.S. Office of Education and is now in the second year of operation. Lawrence Gomez and John Roybal described the process by which competencies are being developed. They also discussed the process by which the experience of the Teacher Corps will be incorporated into the teacher education program at Adams State College.

Undergraduate Pre-Service Teacher Education Program, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado

William E. Briggs
Karl Openshaw
Lawrence Senesh
Benno Klank
James Wailes
Miles Olson
John Haas

The Undergraduate Pre-Service Teacher Education Program, funded by the National Science Foundation, is designed to promote cooperation between the School of Education and the School of Arts and Sciences for the improvement of preservice teacher education. The staff of UPSTEP described the rationale and objectives of the program; after a general overview, the social science, science, elementary, and secondary education components were explained in detail.

Public School-Based Programs

Human Relations Master Plan, Bell Junior High School, Golden, Colorado

Richard County
Joan Clark
Curt Rokula
Joan Mack

The staff, students, administration, and parents of Bell Junior High School have joined together to humanize and invigorate education at their school. Joint decision-making, shared responsibilities, and accountability are important parts of this program which was described by the assistant principal and three teachers from Bell Junior High.

Widefield Teacher Training Program, Widefield School District #3, Security, Colorado

William Stenson
Gilbert Munoz

William Stenson, Assistant Superintendent, and Gilbert Munoz, Principal, described the inservice teacher training program which has been conducted for the last three years in the Widefield Schools. They used video-tapes and slides to illustrate the program, which is designed to train teachers in the skills of individualizing instruction to make Widefield a continuous progress school system.

Other Programs

Training for Cross-Cultural Involvement, Center for Research and Education, Estes Park, Colorado

Richard Rocchio

The Center for Research and Education has been deeply involved in training Peace Corps workers in understanding the life-style and attitudes of various cultures. Richard Rocchio conducted an actual training experience with the participants to show the techniques used by the Center.

Mountain View Center for Teacher Education, Boulder, Colorado

Tony Kallet
Jean Jacobson
Patti McKinnell

The Mountain View Center has been funded by the Ford Foundation to work with teachers, school systems, and children to help schools evolve toward better education. A staff member and two participating teachers discussed various phases of the program.

PART FOUR

Noon Session

Monday, August 2, 1971

TRENDS IN EDUCATION IN ENGLAND, NEW ZEALAND, AND THE UNITED STATES: A COMPARISON

by Elwyn Richardson

I wish to give some attention to what I might call trends in education, and to what I have observed in this country, England, my own country of New Zealand, and elsewhere. Some of you might like to bring me up promptly about my statements; please feel free to interrupt or do what you wish with me, but then again, perhaps you will let me get over this one: It is generally conceded that the kind of education which is very common in America is in some sort of trouble. There has been much written about this in recent years, and I know I'm talking to an enlightened group of people who are familiar with the writings of Charles Silberman in his Crisis in the Classroom (in my own opinion, this report is quite dated--perhaps ten years old!) in which he refers to some of the problems in American education. He also directs our attention to the areas in which we are likely to solve some of our problems, and he mentions the English infant school as a place from which a good deal of enlightenment will be obtained. Now, whereas I agree with this, and I know that there are lots of schools in your country which are in trouble, I also see schools in England that are in trouble too, for the same kinds of reasons. I'm familiar with similar problems in New Zealand. This half hour, I'd like to talk about the kinds of things I have seen in my wanderings through America.

In my observations of American education, I've only scratched the surface, but one of the things I've noticed is that education is really very much the same all over this country. This astounds me. I thought that all the different, diverse kinds of educational administration you have here would give rise to much regional variance. On the other hand, there are very unusual things happening in isolated spots. For instance, in North Dakota there are many fairly innovative classrooms and well-thought-out-types of programs being set up. I've worked in New York and seen attempts to solve their multitudinous problems. But, generally, as far as public education in America is concerned, there is much similarity among the programs in use.

Whereas Charles Silberman and others tell us we ought to cast our eyes to the schools of England for some of the solutions to the problems we have here, I think some are being solved in this country, and others are beginning to be solved. I'd like to cast a ray of hope on some of the programs that I have observed in this country, which I think are damn good. For instance, I think the work I have seen in New York City, directed by Dr. Lillian Weber, is magnificent. Her approach is basically "English infant school" adapted to American needs. She is running several more-or-less experimental programs in various public schools from City College. She has done some remarkable things with New York teachers--many of whom have startled me by their hardness, by the belligerence of large numbers of them, and by the kinds of assault you meet when you go into these schools in New York. There is often little sympathy for children, or even interest in them; the problems which arise in that situation in terms of discipline are great.

There are many other good programs that I have seen, and one of them is the Laboratory School on the campus of Champaign-Urbana, where real attempts are being made to solve some of the problems of formality and the textbook approach, which I see so commonly in this country. I've been in poor classrooms where everything that ever happens is already in a textbook and, subject by subject, the teacher comes to the front, pulls the class texts off the shelves, and then often as not, the students do some sort of ditto sheet, and finally are graded. There never seems to be any kind of real teacher, or real child in that place; everybody and everything is graded, item after item. These are negative things, however, and I do not wish to dwell on them.

The kind of thing which is happening in the English infant school is interesting, in that it arose from the teachers' needs and not from the colleges. It arose pragmatically as a real kind of need the teachers had for finding something more meaningful for children, and began with the infant teachers. How it was effected, and how it arose, and how it was engendered, seems to be slightly misunderstood in this country. It is the common thing for people to go over to England on a package trip and see what schools they can in various countries, and come back very regularly as an expert on what's going on in England. In actual fact, the English teacher,

as I see him, is a very modest person, and considering the amount of work he puts into his classroom, doesn't quite tell the truth about what he does.

I have been with American teachers visiting an English classroom where the visitors discuss effort with the teacher. These classrooms may have activity centers going on around the room: in one corner there might be a math center, in another there is geology going on, and there will be a library center with masses of lovely books (child-centered books, which seem to be uncommon in schools in this country; there seem to be more academically-centered types of books in school libraries in your country). Five children may be working at the science table. The American teacher says, "This seems very interesting. Did you have to do much work to get this all going?" And the English teacher says: "Well, no, not really."

And thereby is the great lie; they work like the blazes, and they are really at it all the time. As I see it, better teaching calls for <u>far more</u> work than formal education does. The American comes back from England with some idea that they know about activity programs and all you have to do is be involved in some kind of revolution--and all will be well--when in actual fact is is an evolution. The English pattern of affairs took around 35 years to develop.

I was one who, at one stage, threw everything out of the classroom door, textbooks and all. It's a damnable life to be left with nothing. The kind of thing that I advocate, and which has been advocated by the innovative people in this country, is a gradual evolution--we don't want teachers to abandon what we have--we want something better out of science, we want something better out of mathematics--but we must counteract the all too prevalent idea in America, that everything is in the textbook or everything is in the package deal. Whatever it is in the package and whatever it is in the science box, is the only thing that there is. There is nothing else. We need new materials which evoke a real response from children.

I think that the better teacher in England has an imaginative ability to get the best out of a teaching situation. He stimulates the child to explore on his own, and, as much as he might, extends the group's or individual's learning by his own contributions. He sets up a kind of "web of learning," inspiring study and more study, in depth. This seems much less common in this country.

I would like to discuss observations of two approaches to science which I made in New Zealand. This might give a clearer picture of the differences I see in the approaches I'm talking about.

Two teachers were doing a study in an ecological field. They were teaching grade seven or eight, but they came from separate junior high schools. The study was of the same section of a beach. Both were science specialty teachers, and in both instances these teachers had manuals of work, or "package deals," telling them what to do at a beach. One teacher taught through ditto sheets and several scientific materials which he got from museums and other places. All the animals and all the plants the kids were going to meet from the sand dune region right down to the high tidal region, over the sand flat to the high tide on the beach, had been studied from these packaged materials. The children know exactly what they were going to meet. They arrived at the beach with their ditto sheets, and ball point pens, ready to tick off and check the various kinds of information they were going to find. I observed these children, and they had an enormous amount of purpose, a great deal of direction, and more than usual confidence. They had all the qualities that a good teacher and good organizer would desire of them. They went onto the beach, found specimens, checked them, even plunked them on top of the diagrams, to see if they "matched." The students then ticked off the information and put it into the box marked shells, the box marked algae, the box marked echinoderms, etc., and proceeded to label them--to put "x" marks correlating one thing with another. In an hour they were finished. Whereupon the teacher said, "All back in the bus." In many ways they needn't have come to the beach.

The other group arrived with their fairly open-minded, innovative teacher who had been there before. I thought it was good that he had visited before. He decided that children were children and they were really interested in the beach, so the first thing they did was have a swim and eat their lunch. They were looked upon with scorn by the other children who were busy ticking off their check lists. After lunch was over, the second group went onto the beach and the teacher said, "Well, let's look at the problems we have on this beach. It seems to me very complicated. There seem to be lots of different animals living in different places. Let's go and have a look first. Let's wander at large and when I blow my whistle or ring the bell,

you come back to me as you can. But if you find something really interesting, stay there and you can pick up with what we are doing later." In other words, he let them play around; he let them mess about with what was there, and they "exposed" themselves to the beach. When the bell rang most of them came back. Four of them didn't--they were way out up to their knees in the low-tidal sand flats. The teacher said, "Well, what sort of things have we found out?" and one kid said, "Well, look, underneath the old seaweed here there are lots of different hopping insects. There seem to be several sorts and in this matchbox here I've got this little, glossy, spotted beetle, like a lady-bug."

I thought this was marvelous, because it was definitely in the lady-bug family. These kids had been trained to know a little about families rather than about species, something which doesn't seem to happen enough in education. We don't go to broad classifications enough. Taxonomy from the broad classification level teaches the place for creatures and plants, whereas specific study of the actual place of things doesn't always give the child the ability to induct the general generic characteristics.

The child said they had found other kinds of "hoppy fleas" and he thought there were crustaceans. Somebody else had found many sea eggs and flat, biscuit-like sand dollars, and they had other different kinds of animals, too. The teacher said, "Look, I've got this piece of paper here, what sort of questions do you think we should ask ourselves?" One of the children said, "What are those four guys doing out there on the flat, which is so interesting?" They sent a runner out to ask what was so interesting there, that was not as interesting where we were. Eventually he came back and said, "They've got a magnificent find." The teacher asked, "Should we all go and have a look?" and they said they would like to do that, since they all wanted to get into the water anyhow. When they got near, these chaps said, "Go quietly, go quietly." I was behind taking my shoes off and was the last one to arrive. We were in an area about as big as a large classroom, where these children were observing some two species of gastropods eating, or "pretending" to eat, as some said, some lamellibranchs in the sand. One of these two was eating a lamellibranch and we posed the question: which gastropod opens the clams? We had found out that one species never was found on a partially opened or partially bored shellfish. It was only found with the

other gastropod and an opened shell.

"Look over there, we have counted two species of gastropods. Way over in the far corner we found the two species together; over here we have found five of one kind and nine of another. We've found the species singly and mixed in different proportions." The children found some lamellibranch shells which had obviously been bored by some kind of acid or boring kind of gastropod. Some of the shells were covered by a green slime which seemed to be exuded by one of the species of gastropod. These kids were absolutely fascinated by what they were beginning to see.

The teacher started to write out lots of questions--he had to do his bit, you know. "Okay, let's try to see which of these gastropods is doing the opening of the shellfish, and ....." I could go on, but in actuality these kids found out some very important science, and came up with lots of probable answers and surmises, very few of which were definite.

This is really what science and good education is all about. When I referred this to a malacologist, this chap said that their work was very interesting, and that they did find something out. He had observed that the one species never appeared to open shells; it was assisted by the larger gastropod--a symbiotic relationship. He said he really never came to the answers easily, and asked what else the kids did on the beach that day. I replied, "That was all they did." He asked, "Didn't they get any kind of idea about zonal gradation; of the algae living in the area of the predatory mollusk they had studied; of the high zonal lamellibranchs; of the high tidal pool communities?" I said, "No," and he said, "Good, because that's all they ever do and usually there is little discovery in that." That is all they ever do from the scientific box which the scientific specialist produces. But thesechildren in the second group worked with that teacher--the stuff that science education is made of.

I thinkthis little story may give you an idea of the kind of quality, the kind of innovation, which teachers must encourage. Our teacher doesn't overstructure, but he has a background which he does not hesitate to use. When those children went back to the classroom, they were really in a position to read the reference books he had for them. He brought out the material, and then the children wanted to know about the various tidal zones.

When they went back and had another look, each child saw science more meaningfully. One boy wanted to study the high-tidal insects in seaweed and fish heads cast out by the fishermen. They collected their creatures and tried to find out about them. Other kids were painting watercolor transectional profiles of the beach. Others were watching the various gulls and feeding them. There is a different quality in this teacher, which I admire.

Now the better teacher in England is a teacher who doesn't hesitate to use any kind of textbook material, any kind of reference material there may be, but he generally does not use boxed science equipment. He has some sort of sense about the kind of situation which is going to be productive. If he sees a bluejay in the window, he doesn't hesitate to drop algebra and talk about the bird in the window. It's a very important bird. Incidentally, I met a citizen of Boulder who didn't even know what a bluejay was; he thought it was a magpie. I think it is absolutely incredible, that a person can go through a formal education and be this unobservant or ignorant of his environment. You can stand up and tell children what something is until you are blue in the face, and still they may not learn; but if you involve them, they do. This is something I know that you know.

The English system of education appears to evoke this turn of imagination from teachers. The activity method of the English is often described as the children doing what the children want to do, but it isn't always this way at all. The teacher always has a curriculum in his pocket, and doesn't hesitate to pull it out and make it work. Never believe what you hear about these teachers, especially if you visit an English school and the teacher tells you that the program is only a child-centered one and he doesn't have a curriculum. I worked for a short while with most of the advisory service of Leicestershire County, and I know very well that their best teachers do not hesitate at any time to bring in a good idea, such as the beach one, and it soon becomes oriented in terms of the children. Such a study has many directions, not one, finite, step-by-step direction which is the teacher's.

Such a teacher encourages divergence, the quality of mind which the advisor encourages in his teachers. The kind of advisory help you see in England, the good kind of advisors you see in this country, too, they are the same sort of people. They talk about the possibility of a situation, not

about the use and issue of equipment, which is often the total reason for their visit. They bring good ideas and they trade ideas.

One of the things I would love to see here is a local interchange of teachers. This is what happens in New Zealand and in England. Teachers hear about a good idea down the road and they go down and find out about it. Maybe somebody is digging their own clay and making their own kilns. Somebody up the road is really "hot" on mathematics so they go away for a day, and somehow the institution is kept going in their absence. County education encourages them to go and puts in a replacement teacher. They go away, and find out about new ideas.

In England and other countries, I see something which intrigues me a great deal. I've been involved in experimental education now for the last 20 years. Over the last ten, since I wrote my book, In the Early World, (Pantheon Press, 1964) something has been happening amongst teachers. It is an intriguing change, because it comes from the teachers' needs and is a genuine interpretation of what they think education should be about. There appear to be two important things taking place: teachers are coming to understand more and more about the area of education which we call "expression", or creativity as some people call it. I would like to define creativity more carefully. Some people say everything is creative. I don't, because much of it is merely conceptualization. There are people who understand creativity and children. I have found out that children need, and should have a large part of the day for their own expression about the knowledge which comes to them from the content of the day's work. The teacher brings to bear something like the history of the wall of China and the history of a Mongolian emperor. He tries to make this alive with pictures of people, their armour, their homes, etc., and with stories. The students may want to integrate, in the sense that they are going to conceptualize for themselves by writing, by painting, by talking, by acting out what the teacher has introduced--and this is generally not creative. It is just conceptualization--learning. However, the kids usually don't even get enough time for that kind of understanding in the classroom. It doesn't happen at all, because we are subject-oriented.

There is another very important part of their education which is considered by teachers but is often left out completely: kids need time to write, talk, act, and make music; to talk and be creative about numbers, physics, science, and about things which are personal, things which have absolutely nothing to do with the teacher.

The second thing which I see teachers being concerned with, which I think is so important, is the growth of aesthetic values. Teachers should discuss the quality of students' expression at all times, so that in a normal classroom the children should be improving themselves as people, in the sense that they are learning to understand each others' motives and the general joy of communication with the aesthetic pleasures offered by natural materials and the things they create in class. Children should be writing about their day-to-day contacts with other people and other things, painting about them, acting and talking about them, and so on. Children really can discuss the values, the precision, and the facility of what is said in so many ways that they build a growing set of cultural values within their classroom. This leads to a kind of microcosmic culture which exists in one classroom, and is different from that which you would see in another. It is real and alive and wonderful. But what happens is the opposite of this: what you do today is generally what you do tomorrow, and the quality of life tomorrow is in no way different from what it was yesterday. If a child were out in a garden and he said, "I dug my toe with a spade," I'd say, "Great!" That is precise and imaginative use of one word. I wouldn't make any other comment which might be negative--except in a very cursory kind of way perhaps about his lack of punctuation. The teacher can go on for hours and hours with exercises and formal, unrelated lessons and we can ask children to correct or put in mine-fields of punctuation in such copy, but nothing is so effective as education through his own language expression; it at least should be something about himself, but it could be about the people in his own environment or his own classroom. If he is affected in any way, he will learn. I was interested and pleased to see this sort of education through children's own language taking place in England.

One of my early associations was with Max Beberman, whom I respect immensely. He might well be described as one of the last of the Renaissance princes--at least that is my personal interpretation of him. Max Beberman

was a very astute gentleman, who came from science and math and realized that the usual kind of systematized approach was failing. He was in England for some time and made a study of the activity approach to learning. When I first met him, he asked me to expound on my ideas about creativity as aesthetics. I said that I thought that "expression" was an enormously important part of education which wasn't being well considered anywhere. People in the "open school" movement think they have a hold on it, but they don't know what to do with it. Theirs' is a revolution, and revolutions quite often land people in a lot of trouble.

Max and I planned to go to England to have a look at the kinds of development he had observed taking place. He had met about 12 teachers in England who were discovering something of a new approach to expression and to a values system. He said he had seen children painting in ways an artist would; he felt these children were thinking in paint. He said these kids had been painting since they were four years old. He had seen ten- to fourteen-year-olds who were painting daily, and they too were expressing themselves as painters would. He had gone to other places, and had seen children using mathematical ideas in a real and innovative way. They were rediscovering mathematics. He talked of observing other children who were writing in a highly creative way. He saw mime and art, and, to a limited extent, some creative music. In other words, he had observed a trend towards creative expression and generally more purposeful innovation taking place, much as I had known it in laboratory schools I had run in New Zealand. I looked forward to viewing these developments with him; however, he died soon after, and although I did see some of this kind of growth in England, I did not see anywhere near as much as I might have in his company.

I would like to talk briefly about some of the frustrations we have felt at the Mountain View Center in the past year in our attempts to extend better education ideas. We found it very difficult to find teachers who were prepared to work hard at ideas we presented for better education in their classrooms. We found it very difficult to get any kind of total commitment to the sorts of idea that we stand for. We have been trying to offer people a wide-range of environmental experiences which could be very personally satisfying for children and for teachers. We wanted to offer these people a chance to be involved in music, sound, drama, weaving, dying, and such things--the chemistry of those sorts of things; in mathematics and physics, in writing, in arts and

crafts, and so on. We are concerned about the learning process in the classroom, and have been attempting to change the emphasis from the "tell-listen-tell" process of teaching to one of "do-and-find-out." In much of our association with teachers we have found a soft response. Few have become deeply involved, but these few have had their personal attitudes and joys of living profoundly affected. Good education for children is also good education for teachers. Thus, because of my association with clay craft with children, I now find myself an amateur potter. I find myself very interested in beetles--I collect them, draw them, mount them--but have never found a new one. I'm interested in botany and paleontology and continue to study such things. In many ways I owe my interests to my involvement with children. I've even had one poem published, but by mistake I must admit. It was published in an anthology of children's poetry. The editor wrote to me and asked how old the child was who wrote the poem. I wrote back and said 42. What I'm really trying to say is that education is personal, and not any more nor less personal for the teacher than it is for the children.

I have rambled through some of the highlights of the trends which I see in better education in New Zealand, America, and England. I believe the creative teachers I have described will effect change by the gradual process of their own growth and the interchange of ideas. I'll end on that note.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

DODGE: One note was omitted in what you said, namely, that you have seen innovative and creative education encouraging and facilitating teachers. You find a lot in common among people who have no communication with each other. This is a kind of phenomena to which you would attribute some significance, wouldn't you? Would you say something about that?

RICHARDSON: This is such an enormous question that it spurs me to say several things. First, I think students who come out of colleges in this country are very good. They have the quality of being able to translate barriers from one discipline to another, they are innovative, and I find them very well informed. I find physicists and mathematicians having the same kinds of ideas about innovation, the same ideas about what is necessary in their subject to make it alive and organically growing. I find math teachers wanting to show how their subject can grow into another. These people do not have any tension

about the growth of one subject, about where it leaves off and the others come in. On the other hand, I see teachers constantly saying that their subject stops at this point, and there is no integration of subjects where one ends and something else begins. I find the "stop off" in learning rather common in my country, among a certain class of advisors. They go into the school and advise where science ends and tell teachers not to have the children painting about, or doing watercolors about a beach scene, because it is not science. They say there is only enough time for science.

N. HELBURN: I find one part of your comments very disturbing. You are saying that the really effective teachers are hard working, but I haven't seen very much of that hard work in the university for the most part nor in the secondary schools. I haven't been involved in the elementary schools, but I haven't found very many teachers in the secondary schools who really want to put in those 12 and 14 hours of imaginative, concentrated work. How do you make this practical? How do you turn people on in that direction, if that is indeed an essential part of the process?

RICHARDSON: I have no real answer for you. I really believe that education is a part of one's life style. For instance, I don't think you can get into poetry without becoming a person who reads poetry. I think the only way education will effect anything is to be involved at the level of experience. Recently we ran a university course for a week or two in which we tried to involve a group of people, so they would become historians about Caribou, a little ghost town up in the hills near Boulder. We did our level best to "turn these people on" about the whole delight of being a historian in regional research of that kind. I think this is the way education has to go. There is hard work which becomes synonymous with fun, and what is hard work is merely devotion to the task for concentrated periods of time.

I find myself devoting all my spare time to studying the morphology and rocks of Colorado, because I just love doing it. It can't help but have a "spin off" quality. If I'm an enthusiastic teacher, I can't help but pick up rocks and taking them into the classroom.

Hard work means there must be a heavy commitment or personal involvement by the teacher.

Subject-oriented work is definitely unsuitable for many of the children who go into junior high and secondary education. We put up with many things that administrators latch onto; the current heresy is the cult of "open space"

classrooms. England tried open space education a decade ago and if you ask the administrators over there what they think about open space education, they will be very embarrassed and admit that it failed. One director of education told me it was "one of the unfortunate things we did." There are lots of things to get over, things that affect the quality of education.

WILLIAMS: It was most disheartening to hear you say that "open space" schools are limiting.

RICHARDSON: Well, not entirely, but there should be ways of having intimate space if you need it.

WILLIAMS: How do you feel about the American science program?

RICHARDSON: I don't know. I have given you some indications of what I think about science generally. I would go back to something that wasn't a package deal, that wasn't a textbook. The teacher should have some sort of broad outlines but new kinds of interpretations and new kinds of things to do, even with the same old materials.

WILLIAMS: Do you feel that England, New Zealand, and these other countries have so much better kinds of education than we have?

RICHARDSON: No, they're copying your science as fast as it can be done. I feel the greatest destruction for education is this textbook one, this package deal. People in these countries are buying textbooks and putting them in their classrooms as fast as they can. I have seen a science package in England which is very similar to one in this country, where every question has its answer, so the teacher may stand in front of the class and recite from the book. He just reads out of the book, and every response is there. I think this is so terribly bad.

Each teacher must have some sort of substance on which she is basing her ideas at a particular time, otherwise nothing can be done. The quality you are talking about--the lazy teachers comment--needs a further comment. I don't think I have seen very many hard-working teachers in America. They work much harder in England; they really are hard-working there. They are raking out new books all the time, getting new ideas, reading, studying, bringing to bear, gathering groups of children to make sure they are learning effectively. They are concerned about the kid who doesn't read. This activity program in England does marvelous things about those kinds of children, and they have less reading problems than in this country. Perhaps English activity education is better than the usual American education.

SINGER: Do they have to take so many methods courses, which don't mean anything, and the fundamental courses?

RICHARDSON: No, they just take different sorts of methods courses. I don't know much about English training colleges, but judging from the comments I have heard so often about them, they are not much better. From what I hear, they tend to be over-academically inclined and have little of the kind of innovative quality of education. They don't have that general, interdisciplinary kind of learning activity which is going to give the teacher some kind of precept for management in his own classroom. What do you do about the fellow whose job it is to teach history and it's not his job to teach art? The art teachers here don't do art, by the way--all they do is a series of exercises. You go to a classroom one day and they may all be doing snow crystals, and the next day it is some sort of experiment on balance. Two weeks later they are doing something on harmony or something like that. They don't really get around to the personal kind of expression which is really fundamental. This is why English art is so damn good--Oxfordshire art is fine.

SINGER: But you are asking for a fantastic teacher!

RICHARDSON: No, no, I'm not at all. No, I'm just asking for a normal kind of human being who doesn't stop being educated. I just think the kind of qualities that tertiary education is concerned with are only the fundamentals of education. Education does not very often seem to affect the individual at the university. It didn't affect me; I went through my education and got out of it pretty scot-free. But it did turn me on in a few sorts of ways, so that eventually I did pick up a great deal out of it. You see people who are graduates, and masters, and doctors of literature, and they don't read! They don't read poetry, nor are they interested in it. You find people who are graduates in mathematics and they have never opened a mathematics book since leaving school. Now to me, this doesn't add up. And education doesn't add up if a kid doesn't go on with it. He doesn't have to become a poet. No kid I ever taught became a poet or an artist or anything--he just became a reasonable sort of human being. We are not expecting a teacher to be a super person.

ISRAEL: Can we go back to the beach for a moment, and the two teachers? I'm sure we know which of the two you think is the better. But let's suppose for a moment that we put them into a performance contract situation.

RICHARDSON: Oh dear, which would be the better scientist? The second fellow? I would get a decent sort of assessor, I'd get somebody of the quality you are talking about, to come along and assess these two programs. That person would need to have no hesitation about assessing the two programs in the kind of way that I have inferred. He'd come out with the right answer, I'm sure.

PART FIVE

Morning Session

Tuesday, August 3, 1971

FINAL PLENARY SESSION

At the Tuesday morning plenary session of the Conference, participants were asked to join small group discussions based on the following topics: 1) specific program proposals, 2) continuing organization, 3) information exchange. Following these small group discussions, the final plenary session of the Conference convened at 11:00 a.m. with Norman Dodge, Assistant Director of the Colorado Commission on Higher Education, presiding. After calling the session to order, he called on Suzanne Helburn to report from Group 1 regarding specific program proposals.

S. HELBURN: In our discussion, the proposal which received the most attention was the desirability of a network of teacher centers in Colorado, to help build cooperation between public schools and institutions engaged in teacher training, and to work in conjunction with various teacher education associations and the State Department of Education. Another aspect of teacher center development would be to try to combine forces and develop one center, then move on and organize another after a center was functioning well in one place.

The end of our discussion revolved around the question of whether to seek various forms of support--from external sources such as National Science Foundation or Office of Education funds--or to reallocate resources already existing in public schools and colleges. The reallocation of existing resources would constitute a call for commitment to some sort of structural change to get the teacher centers going within the institutions which now exist. This is a commitment which we will probably need.

A second proposal was the need to inform and to cooperate with the state legislature. Laura Miller made a suggestion which was very complimentary to this meeting. She learned a great deal here and feels that other legislators should have an opportunity to find out what's going on and what we're thinking about for the future, and to help us plan some of those things. Senator Enstrom pointed out that there would be a hearing of the Committee on Public Education on August 16 and another in early September. It seems very important for us to prepare a presentation for a hearing before that group. And secondly, it is possibly as important or more important to begin developing a permanent liaison with legislators so they become involved in and contribute

to the kinds of plans for the future we might deem important. This will possibly provide us with a little more reality orientation, too.

So it seemed to us that what the group as a whole needs to do is to come up with planning committees--people who will make the commitment to begin work on these activities as of now. John, is there something else I should add as a summary?

HAAS: The things you've outlined are specific proposals that require some kind of planning committees, and this plenary session should deal with that. If it doesn't, it won't happen.

DODGE: May I suggest we put these recommendations in the framework of Groups 2 and 3 to see how they relate.

S. HELBURN: We do want to come back to the actual nitty gritty of getting people to carry through with these proposals.

DODGE: This will be on the agenda after Groups 2 and 3 have reported. Otto, will you report from Group 2 on the matter of continuing organization?

RUFF: Many organizations are interested in teacher education, so we listed some of them. This list includes Colorado Education Association, Colorado Federation of Teachers, the State School Boards Association, PTAs, the Colorado Department of Education, the State Board of Education, legislators certainly, students and student organizations, such as student National Education Association and Colorado Education Association. There are many other groups. We propose to have representatives from each of these groups form a Colorado Council on Teacher Education. This Council, as soon as it is organized, would be self-perpetuating. It would be an incorporated body which could receive and dispense money. Hopefully, the Council can raise sufficient funding by having each of these interested groups contribute $1,000 or $500 or whatever sum. Colleges of teacher education and public and private teacher education institutions would have representatives on this Council. The Council would probably have a fall, winter, and spring meeting with such other meetings as they would deem necessary.

We also listed some tasks they might perform. One is keeping the Council going--organization, administration, rotation of members, programs, projects, and so on. Another job is certainly involved in legislation. The Teacher Education Council in Nebraska had a committee on certification and a committee on preservice. They had an inservice committee and a committee which visited institutions and reported to the Council, which in turn reported to the State

Board of Education regarding approval of institutions for teacher education in terms of certification. We're suggesting here the kinds of jobs this Council might see to be done.

The question is, how do we get something like this going? There needs to be a catalyst or someone to start the thing. It was felt perhaps the Social Science Education Consortium or the Commission on Higher Education, or both, might provide the spark to get it off the ground. Once it's organized, it would be self-perpetuating.

Teacher education in Colorado at the present time has very little visibility. If the Council were organized and really influential, reporters would be at this conference in great numbers. We would recommend that this kind of organization be started, hopefully to serve as a nucleus for an ongoing organization into the indefinite future with all of these interests involved. Loretta Konecki will read our resolution:

KONECKI: Group 2 submits the following resolution: "Be it proposed that a Council on Teacher Education be established with initial task force being created today (August 3, 1971) and supported through the human resources of the Colorado Commission on Higher Education and the Social Science Education Consortium and the monetary resources of the participants of the conference and the institutions to be represented on the Council. It is recommended that the following persons constitute the initial task force: Otto Ruff, Donald Luketich, Frances Haley, Eugene Kelly, M.C. Davis, Leo Valdez, Lawrence Gomez, Loretta Konecki, Jean Knight Bain, Paul Hamilton, Chester Enstrom, and William Israel."

The list has been kept small and you might want to discuss these names. I'd like to suggest that the issues which the Group raised might be the kinds of things which could come under the Council's concern.

DODGE: If you wish to so constitute yourselves as an action group, it would be quite appropriate for the report just made to be presented as a recommendation to the conference from Group 2. Do you so move?

KONECKI: I so move.

DODGE: Is this motion seconded?

GROUP: Second.

DODGE: Is there discussion of this motion?

N. HELBURN: I move this motion be tabled until we've heard the third report.

DODGE: A motion to table is before us. Is this motion seconded?

GROUP: Second.

DODGE: We will put the motion in suspended animation while we hear from Nick Helburn representing Group 3.

N. HELBURN: Group 3 on Information Exhcange came up with five recommendations, resolutions if you will.

1. That a summer conference similar to this one be repeated annually, and that provision be made for specialized groups--Deans, student teaching directors, methods teachers, etc.--to meet during the conference.

2. That as participants from this TTT conference become aware of innovations relative to good teaching anywhere in the State of Colorado, they (the individual participant) make such information available to the directors of student teaching through Dr. Otto Ruff; to the Mid-Year Conference through the Director at UNC; and to the School and College Conference through the Director at CU.

3. That the Social Science Education Consortium, 855 Broadway, Boulder, become for the interim: 1) the repository for innovative teacher education materials developed by school districts, colleges, and universities in Colorado; 2) responsible for distributing and updating the directory of Alternative Teacher Education Programs, Colorado Innovates; and 3) the editor and coordinator of news items on teacher education contributed by schools, colleges, and universities to a proposed new column, "The Funnel and Sieve," in Education Colorado.

4. That individuals in this group continue to promote and nurture those invaluable person-to-person contacts and interactions which cause dissemination of institutional information to become a truly meaningful vehicle for educational progress.

5. That the following lists be mailed to all TTT conferees for the purposes of collecting and disseminating information on new and innovative teacher training programs:

a) All Colorado publications on education for the purposes of finding and publishing new information;

b) All Colorado media for publicity on new information;

c) Colorado leaders in educational decision-
making for the purpose of personal contact.

DODGE: Thank you. If there's no objection, we will lift off the table the motion that has already been made and open it to discussion. Could we have the motion repeated?

KONECKI: "Be it proposed that a Council on Teacher Education be established with initial task force being created today (August 3, 1971) and supported through the human resources of the Colorado Commission on Higher Education and the Social Science Education and the monetary resources of the participants of the conference and the institutions to be represented on the Council. It is recommended that the following persons constitute the initial task force: Otto Ruff, Donald Luketich, Frances Haley, Eugene Kelly, M.C. Davis, Leo Valdez, Lawrence Gomez, Loretta Konecki, Jean Knight Bain, Paul Hamilton, Chester Enstrom, and William Israel."

DODGE: You have had a resume of the motion, it has been duly seconded, and is now open for discussion.

SCHMIDT: Did Group 2 have any idea when the Task Force would be finished with its first proposal? We are concerned about this because of the teacher center idea which could be the responsibility of the Task Force.

DODGE: Was there a notion of time within which the Task Force would come up with an organization proposal?

KONECKI: There was not, but there was the assumption in the group that it would be immediately.

VALDEZ: Would it be asking too much that this ad hoc committee remain for a few minutes to set a date for the first meeting?

DODGE: Does this group wish to charge the Task Force with any sense of urgency? There is another possibility, that in the event it looks as though the Council organization is taking too long, the Consortium office be at least an intermediate action channel. I don't know whether this is satisfactory or not.

S. HELBURN: There's still the issue of making a presentation before the legislative committee on August 18, which has to be prepared starting today or tomorrow, if we're going to do that. Should we keep that separate or should it come under the Council?

DODGE: Let's assume that the Council is going to have enough of a task getting organized and developing a long range perspective in behalf of the group assembled here, and that there are some existing agencies on whom Senator Enstrom

can call which have a chance to communicate with the legislature. If this is an immediate task to be done on behalf of education, I think we can rely on existing agencies using the report of this conference that will be prepared.
STEVENS: I don't think so. Group 1 was a committee of the whole and there was a definite grass roots feeling within the group that we would report and make a presentation to the legislature, not that we go through the Commission or the State Department as has usually been done in the past.
DODGE: I'm totally in sympathy with this. All I'm suggesting is that the task of keeping in touch with the grass roots would be an administrative chore, which you could rely on inducing the agencies to perform, rather than waiting for an organization to be developed. If this is not the meaning or the wish of the group, there's nothing mandatory about it. In other words, we /The Colorado Commission on Higher Education/ offer our services to facilitate the things you want to do, if you're nervous about whether the Council will be organized in time.
STENSON: Are any of the people on this list in charge of inservice training in the public schools or people in charge of continuing education at least?
DODGE: Who represents the public schools, or public school administrators, or public school districts?
HALEY: There is no public school person, with the exception of Paul Hamilton, who is a teacher as well as a legislator.
STENSON: I move that we add to this list Mr. Milton Schmidt from Cherry Creek.
RUFF: And Frank Roberts from Denver Public Schools. However, it should be made clear that this is just a task force for organizational purposes.
DODGE: Your point, Bill, is that the perspective of the public schools ought to be reflected on the Task Force, which is a point well taken. Do you wish to suggest that the drafter of the resolution amend it by including the name of Milton Schmidt or Frank Roberts.
STENSON: Yes, I so move.
GROUP: Second.
KONECKI: I will incorporate into the resolution the names of Milton Schmidt and Frank Roberts.
DODGE: Is it acceptable to the membership of the group that the motion be amended in this way? The motion has been amended by the initiator to include two additional names for a committee of 14. Any further discussion of the motion? Are you ready for the question? Have you looked at the implications

of this motion in Group 1 and Group 3 to see whether it's consistent with the kinds of actions that you see as necessary? All right. All in favor of the motion?

GROUP: Aye.

DODGE: Opposed, no. /No response./ So ordered. Let's go back to Group 1 and ask if you see your concerns being accomodated or not yet accommodated in what's emerged so far. You have all three reports before you. Do you now wish to add some action proposal from Group 1 that would insure further progress on the kinds of concerns that you have?

S. HELBURN: We recommend that one, possibly two, committees be organized: a committee to prepare a presentation before the legislative committee and to follow up with the kinds of liaison that we might want to develop, and a committee to organize another conference of people interested in the teacher center idea or the business of partnership between colleges and schools in the development of pre- and inservice teacher education. There could be one committee, or there could be two different groups.

DODGE: What is your recommendation?

S. HELBURN: I think it could be the same group.

DODGE: You're talking about a specifically charged committee which would be responsible for both tasks, but I don't hear you say whether this is in connection with or separate from your preparation of a report of the implications of this conference.

S. HELBURN: I think the information from this conference would go into the presentation to the legislature, but we would need additional input.

DODGE: In essence, then, feedback from this conference and its implications would be made available by planned design directly to the legislative committee. Do you wish then to propose a specific committee charged with this responsibility?

HAAS: We'd like the total group to suggest names.

DODGE: All right. A motion has been made that we establish such a committee. Why don't you suggest some names of people who would be helpful to draft such a report and put both into one motion?

HAMILTON: Perhaps the people who gave demonstrations here should be on the committee to make the presentation to the legislature. If you are talking to legislators or other groups who may not be as attuned as some of us here to what's going on, you ought to have a short demonstration, or at least a review,

of one of the projects so they can see what is happening in addition to reading a report.

RATLIFF: I got the feeling from Mrs. Bain that this wasn't the type of presentation which would be appropriate. At this particular point in time, a more generalized, informative presentation to the legislature, rather than information about specific innovative programs would be more appropriate.

DODGE: Why doesn't this group charge your committee with negotiating, on your behalf, the framework, content, and context within which the presentation would be most appropriate, rather than trying to solve it here?

LUKETICH: I move that Suzanne Helburn be chairman of this committee and that she select her own group to work with her.

GROUP: Second.

DODGE: The motion has been made and seconded that a committee be established with Suzanne Helburn as chairman and that she be empowered to draft those to work with her. Further discussion on this motion as the sense of the conference? All in favor please say aye.

GROUP: Aye.

DODGE: Any opposed, no? /No response/ So ordered. Is there further unfinished business with respect to the concerns of Group 1?

VALDEZ: I'd like to clarify one thing on the presentation to the legislature of August 16. It was implied the committee might meet in early September, and I'd just like to get an opinion from Senator Enstrom as to which time would be best.

ENSTROM: It might be better to wait until the September meeting. It's possible the new commissioner will be appointed by that time and I think he should be at this meeting. Also, our agenda for the 16th may be pretty well filled; however, if we thought it was necessary we might rearrange our agenda for the 16th.

DODGE: Thank you. Any further comment?

STEVENS: Do I understand that this committee would also investigate the pulling together of a group that will develop a proposal or plan for teacher centers within the state?

DODGE: Sue, how do you read your charge? Would you include this or would you rather someone else be responsible for pulling together a statewide sponsored proposal regarding teacher centers?

S. HELBURN: I think it could be separate.

STEVENS: I would recommend it be the same.

HALEY: I'd like to suggest that perhaps the Task Force could assume responsibility for the proposals from Group 1 and Group 3 as part of the Council on Teacher Education. Dr. Ruff mentioned five or six different kinds of things the Council could do, including preservice and inservice programs.

STEVENS: I don't think we have time for them to get organized.

DODGE: Could I invite a comment from an observer, here by invitation? He represents the Southwest Regional Cluster of TTT, Gene Slaughter from Oklahoma. He has some insights on the teacher center concept which might be helpful to inject at this point.

SLAUGHTER: I would suggest that one of the pieces of business of the new Council would be to appoint a committee to draft a proposal to carry out the idea of the teacher center. Instead of my suggesting what a teacher training center might be, that proposal committee should look into the different models of teacher training centers which have been developing in the past year. Then make your proposal so it fits Colorado, and ask for EPDA money to support the kind of teacher training centers that Colorado needs.

DODGE: Do you have any recommendation, Gene, on two points: a) the time frame within which proposal development is likely to be expected, and b) whether the process envisions planning grants followed by proposals or direct action proposals?

SLAUGHTER: I would go for money and go to win. If you develop your proposal by October you might put in a letter of intent to Mr. Marland now, but I wouldn't ask for a planning grant, I'd ask for operating money.

RATLIFF: I'd like to follow up on the suggestion that Sue's committee, which is going to report to the legislature, be the same one to organize the teacher center proposal, because of the urgency of it. The Council would take longer than if we had a committee directly responsible for getting this job done. I'd like to put that in the form of a motion.

DODGE: The motion is that responsibility for developing the teacher center proposal, in behalf of the group as a whole, be addressed to the committee chaired by Suzanne Helburn and taken on with the resources of the Social

Science Education Consortium, who are quite experienced in writing proposals. The motion has been made and seconded. Any further discussion of that motion? If not, all in favor say aye.

GROUP: Aye.

DODGE: Opposed, no. /No response/ It is so recorded as the sense of the conference. Are you ready for the suggestions and recommendations that come from Group 3 regarding information exchange? Question?

KONECKI: Might it be appropriate for Sue's group to report what they're doing to the Council so there will be interrelationship?

DODGE: Let's be sure Sue hears this as part of her charge: to keep the organizing committee of the Council informed as to what is being done in the development of the teacher center proposal. Conversely, both the Task Force and anyone else who has notions about the shape this proposal ought to take should advise Sue's committee. Now, with respect to Group 3, information exchange recommendations--have you had a chance to look at these to see if they are useful in terms of the kinds of sharing which would advance the causes to which you are all dedicated? Do you wish to move these as a package, Nick, for affirmation by the conference? Milton, a question?

SCHMIDT: Question about number one. I notice there's no proposal in here as to how this summer conference should be paid for.

DODGE: Would it be the expectation of the organizers of the Council that by April of next year you have at least some resources available for planning such a conference? You suggested a conference three times during the academic year. This suggests a summer repeat, not necessarily identical, but a replication of this conference.

RUFF: It would be hard to anticipate what the Council would see as its role, but with the kind of help present here I think the Council would have that kind of conference. Whether they can dig up the money is difficult to tell, but certainly one of their big jobs would be securing funds.

DODGE: I mentioned yesterday that those of you who came "on the house" this time ought to include in next year's budget plan, of your own personal department or institution, replication of a similar amount of dollars to help insure at least the coming together--not all the background perhaps--and then give the Council the responsibility of organizing presentations and information of interest. You have a motion before you at this time to pass this

conference resolution from Group 3. Is there any further discussion? If not, all in favor please say aye.

GROUP: Aye.

DODGE: Opposed, no. /No response/ Motion carried. I note the hour of adjournment is approaching. Is there any further expression of sentiment, good will, or affirmation?

VALDEZ: I'd like to say in closing that, in my tenure as a teacher and being around education, I've been to a lot of conferences and not very many of them have been very beneficial to me. But I want to thank you for including me in this conference. I feel that I really gained something from this, and I welcome the challenge of our legislator, Paul Hamilton, who said, "Prove to us that you have gained something from this conference by doing something." I think we've proved to him that we are going to do something as a result of this conference, and that all of us will meet again, hopefully next summer. M.C. Davis and I have integrated Spanish and Swahili, and come up with a phrase which I'd like to close with: pamojas venceremos. In today's terminology, it means "Right On!" Thank you very much.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

TRENDS AND ISSUES IN TEACHER EDUCATION IN COLORADO

August 1 - 3, 1971

* *

FRANK C. ABBOTT
Executive Director
Colorado Commission on Higher Education
719 State Services Building
Denver, Colorado 80205

CHRISTINE ALVAREZ
Student, Manual High School
1700 East 28th Avenue
Denver, Colorado 80205

ROBERT ARRIETA
Intern, Teacher Corps
Southern Colorado State College
Pueblo, Colorado 81005

JEAN KNIGHT BAIN
Chairman, Education Committee
Colorado House of Representatives
755 Gaylord Street
Denver, Colorado 80206

THOMAS BARLOW
Dean, School of Education
University of Colorado
Denver Center
1100 14th Street
Denver, Colorado 80202

CLIFFORD BEBELL
Chairman, Department of Education
Southern Colorado State College
Pueblo, Colorado 81005

LEO BENN
Student, Manual High School
1700 East 28th Avenue
Denver, Colorado 80205

DONALD N. BIGELOW
Director, Division of Program Resources
U. S. Office of Education
Washington, D. C. 20202

THOMAS E. BOYLE
Dean, College of Arts and Sciences
University of Northern Colorado
Greeley, Colorado 80631

FRED J. BRIEVE
College of Education
Virginia Tech
Blacksburg, Virginia 24061

WILLIAM E. BRIGGS
Dean, College of Arts and Sciences
University of Colorado
159 Hellems
Boulder, Colorado 80302

GEORGE BROOKE
Chairman, Department of Education
Metropolitan State College
333 West Colfax Avenue
Denver, Colorado 80203

ALPHONSE BUCCINO
Associate Program Director
Academic Year Study Program
National Science Foundation
1800 G Street Northwest
Washington, D. C. 20202

GLENN BURNHAM
Assistant Professor of Education
Adams State College
Alamosa, Colorado 81101

LORENA CASEBIER
Division of Education
Western State College
Gunnison, Colorado 81230

JOAN CLARK
Teacher, Bell Junior High School
1001 Ulysses
Golden, Colorado 80401

ROBERT CLIFTON
Assistant Professor of Political Science
Metropolitan State College
333 West Colfax Avenue
Denver, Colorado 80203

RUTH CLINE
Associate Professor of Education
University of Colorado
204 Hellems Annex
Boulder, Colorado 80302

MARY COEN
Student
University of Northern Colorado
Greeley, Colorado 80631

FRANK CORDELL
Chairman, Department of Foundations of Education
University of Northern Colorado
526 McKee Hall
Greeley, Colorado 80631

ROBERT CORNEER
Chairman, Division of Education
Western State College
Gunnison, Colorado 81230

RICHARD COUNTY
Assistant Principal
Bell Junior High School
1001 Ulysses
Golden, Colorado 80401

HAZEL CRAKER
Los Alamos Public Schools
Box 435
Los Alamos, New Mexico 87544

GLENN DAHLEM
Department of Education
Regis College
50th & Lowell Boulevard
Denver, Colorado 80205

NORMAN B. DODGE
Assistant Director
Colorado Commission on Higher Education
719 State Services Building
Denver, Colorado 80205

LEE M. ELLWOOD
Manager, Texas Education Renewal Center
6504 Tracor Lane
Austin, Texas 78721

CHESTER K. ENSTROM
Chairman, Education Committee
Colorado Senate
2650 North 1st, Apartment 3
Grand Junction, Colorado 81501

ANTONIO ESQUIBEL
Cross Cultural Coordinator
Teacher Corps
Southern Colorado State College
Pueblo, Colorado 81005

ROSE MARIE FEARN
Principal, Guardian Angels Elementary School
1841 West 52nd Avenue
Denver, Colorado 80221

TOM FITZGERALD
Director, Teacher Training
Man: A Course of Study
Temple Buell College
1800 Pontiac Street
Denver, Colorado 80210

JOHN A. FLANAGAN
Director of Student Teaching
Colorado State University
Ft. Collins, Colorado 80521

BOBBIE FLEXER
Graduate Student, Math Education
University of Colorado
Boulder, Colorado 80302

BARBARA FULLER
Teacher, Los Alamos Public Schools
Los Alamos, New Mexico 87544

LAWRENCE GOMEZ
Director, Teacher Corps
Adams State College
Alamosa, Colorado 81101

JOEL GONZALES
Intern, Teacher Corps
Southern Colorado State College
Pueblo, Colorado 81005

JOEL GREENSPOON
Chairman, Department of Education
Temple Buell College
1800 Pontiac Street
Denver, Colorado 80210

JESUS GREER
Intern, Teacher Corps
Southern Colorado State College
Pueblo, Colorado 81005

PAUL HAMILTON
Representative, Colorado House of Representatives
2811 Vine Street
Denver, Colorado 80205

HARLEY HISCOX
Executive Director
Colorado Federation of Teachers
360 Acoma Street
Denver, Colorado 80223

JAMES HODGES
Instructor, School of Education
University of Colorado
970 Aurora Avenue
Boulder, Colorado 80302

FRED E. HOLMES
Director, Youth-Community Relations
Colorado State Department of Education
501 State Office Building
Denver, Colorado 80205

GEORGE HUGINS
Director of Student Teaching
Adams State College
Alamosa, Colorado 81101

KENNETH HUSBANDS
Professor of Education
University of Colorado
115 Hellems Annex
Boulder, Colorado 80302

WILLIAM I. ISRAEL
Chairman, Colorado Board of Education
319 Magnolia Lane
Sterling, Colorado 80751

JEAN JACOBSON
Teacher, Lincoln Elementary School
2130 Arapahoe Avenue
Boulder, Colorado 80302

ANTHONY KALLET
Staff Member, Mountain View Center for Environmental Education
Armory Bg., University Ave.
Boulder, Colorado 80302

DEBBIE KARR
Student, Adams State College
Alamosa, Colorado 81101

EUGENE T. KELLY
Chairman, Department of Education
Adams State College
Alamosa, Colorado 81101

CHARLES KILLOUGH
Manager, Texas Education Renewal Center
6504 Tracor Lane
Austin, Texas 78721

BENNO KLANK
Assistant Professor, Physical Science
University of Colorado
224 Ketchum
Boulder, Colorado 80302

LORETTA KONECKI
Chairman, Education Department
Regis College
50th and Lowell Boulevard
Denver, Colorado 80221

ROY KROSKY
Assistant Professor of Education
University of Northern Colorado
Greeley, Colorado 80631

MAUREEN LANCASTER
Student, University of Northern Colorado
4010 Dover Street
Wheatridge, Colorado 80033

DONALD M. LUKETICH
Director, Manual-UNC Project
1007 20th Street
Greeley, Colorado 80631

PATTI MC KINNELL
Assistant Teacher
Lincoln Elementary School
2130 Arapahoe Avenue
Boulder, Colorado 80302

JAMES N. MC LAUGHLIN
Associate, Research and Planning
Colorado Commission on Higher Education
719 State Services Building
Denver, Colorado 80203

JOAN MACK
Teacher, Bell Junior High School
1001 Ulysses
Golden, Colorado 80401

HERBERT MANIG
Community Services Specialist
Project Communi-Link
Colorado State University
Ft. Collins, Colorado 80521

CHARLOTTE MENDOZA
Department of Education
Colorado College
Colorado Springs, Colorado 80904

LAURA MILLER
Representative, Colorado House of Representatives
6100 West Bowles
Littleton, Colorado 80123

BILL MITCHELL
Student, University of Northern Colorado
8221 Tennyson Street
Westminster, Colorado 80030

GILBERT MUNOZ
Principal, North Elementary School
209 Leta Drive
Security, Colorado 80911

CHARLES NEIDT
Academic Vice President
Colorado State University
109 Administration Building
Ft. Collins, Colorado 80521

JOE NICHOLS
Chairman, Department of Curriculum and Instruction
University of Northern Colorado
Greeley, Colorado 80631

MILES C. OLSON
Assistant Professor of Education
University of Colorado
201 Education Annex
Boulder, Colorado 80302

KARL OPENSHAW
Dean, School of Education
University of Colorado
124 Hellems Annex
Boulder, Colorado 80302

A. J. PAULMENO, SR.
Consultant, Pupil Personnel Unit
Office of Continuing Education
402 State Office Building
Denver, Colorado 80203

STANLEY RATLIFF
Director of Student Teaching
University of Colorado
247 Hellems Annex
Boulder, Colorado 80302

ELWYN RICHARDSON
Staff Member, Mountain View Center for Environmental Education
Armory Bg., University Ave.
Boulder, Colorado 80302

FRANK E. ROBERTS
Assistant Executive Director
Elementary Education
Denver Public Schools
414 14th Street
Denver, Colorado 80205

RICHARD ROCCHIO
Associate Director
Center for Research and Education
2150 S. Bellaire Street
Denver, Colorado 80222

CURT ROKULA
Assistant Principal
Bell Junior High School
1001 Ulysses
Golden, Colorado 80401

JOHN ROSALES
Assistant Professor of Education
University of Northern Colorado
Greeley, Colorado 80302

JOHN ROYBAL
Associate Director, Teacher Corps
Adams State College
Alamosa, Colorado 81101

OTTO RUFF
Supervisor, Teacher Education
and Certification
Colorado Department of Education
State Office Building
Denver, Colorado 80203

THOMAS RYAN
Elgin Illinois Public Schools
Teacher of Economics
450 South 40th Street
Boulder, Colorado 80303

MILTON SCHMIDT
Director of Staff Development
Cherry Creek School District
4700 South Yosemite Street
Englewood, Colorado 80110

LAWRENCE SENESH
Professor of Economics
University of Colorado
970 Aurora Avenue
Boulder, Colorado 80302

CARRIE SHEAD
Host Family, UNC Live-In Experience
2735 Milwaukee Street
Denver, Colorado 80205

SORL SHEAD
Host Family, UNC Live-In Experience
2735 Milwaukee Street
Denver, Colorado 80205

MAGDALENE SINGER
Teacher, Los Alamos Public Schools
Los Alamos, New Mexico 87544

EUGENE SLAUGHTER
Coordinator, Oklahoma-Texas
Triple-T Project
Southeastern Oklahoma State College
Durant, Oklahoma 74701

WILLIAM L. STENSON
Assistant Superintendent
Instructional Services
Widefield School District #3
701 Widefield Drive
Security, Colorado 80911

LEWIS E. STIEGHORST
Vice Chairman
Colorado Board of Education
7752 South Ames Way
Littleton, Colorado 80123

ROBERT L. STRADER
Assistant Professor of Education
Southern Colorado State College
Pueblo, Colorado 81005

ARLENE V. SUTTON
Assistant Professor of Education
Southern Colorado State College
Pueblo, Colorado 81005

TIMOTHY R. TOMLINSON
Director, Triple-T
Washington, University
St. Louis, Missouri 63130

LEO J. VALDEZ, JR.
Consultant, Title I and Title III
Special Programs Unit
Department of Education
410 State Office Building
Denver, Colorado 80203

JAMES R. WAILES
Professor of Education
University of Colorado
111 Hellems Annex
Boulder, Colorado 80302

HARRY WATERS
Associate Director
UNC-Manual Project
1007 20th Street
Greeley, Colorado 80631

LOREN WATSON
Host Family, UNC Live-In Experience
2936 High Street
Denver, Colorado 80205

MARY LOU WATSON
Host Family, UNC Live-In Experience
2936 High Street
Denver, Colorado 80205

LYNN WELDON
Professor of Education
Adams State College
Alamosa, Colorado 81101

DONALD WHALEN
Chairman, Division of Education
Ft. Lewis College
Durango, Colorado 81301

MONA WILLIAMS
Teacher, Boulder Valley Schools
1890 Norwood Avenue
Boulder, Colorado 80302

VICTOR WILLSON
Consultant, Laboratory of Educational Research
University of Colorado
104 Education Annex
Boulder, Colorado 80302

HAZLETT H. WUBBEN
Professor of Education
University of Colorado
Boulder, Colorado 80302

JEAN YOUNG
Triple-T Preservice Coordinator
Washington University
St. Louis, Missouri 63130

CARL ZERGER
Director, Inservice Teacher Education
Jefferson County Public Schools
809 Quail Street
Denver, Colorado 80215

CONFERENCE STAFF

TRENDS AND ISSUES IN TEACHER EDUCATION IN COLORADO

August 1 - 3, 1971

* *

JAMES E. DAVIS
Staff Associate
Social Science Education Consortium
855 Broadway
Boulder, Colorado 80302

M. C. DAVIS
Director, Colorado TTT
719 State Services Building
Denver, Colorado 80203

JOHN HAAS
Director, Center for Education
in the Social Sciences
University of Colorado
970 Aurora Avenue
Boulder, Colorado 80302

FRANCES HALEY
Staff Associate
Social Science Education Consortium
855 Broadway
Boulder, Colorado 80302

NICHOLAS HELBURN
Director, ERIC/ChESS
855 Broadway
Boulder, Colorado 80302

SUZANNE WIGGINS HELBURN
Director, Colorado TTT
Follow-Through Program
855 Broadway
Boulder, Colorado 80302

THOMAS ROBERTS
Staff Assistant
Social Science Education Consortium
855 Broadway
Boulder, Colorado 80302

ELLEN SCHULTHEIS
Administrative Assistant,
Special Projects
Social Science Education Consortium
855 Broadway
Boulder, Colorado 80302

RACHEL SENNERT
Secretary
Colorado TTT Follow-Through Program
855 Broadway
Boulder, Colorado 80302

W. WILLIAMS STEVENS, JR.
Associate Director
Social Science Education Consortium
855 Broadway
Boulder, Colorado 80302

NANCY VICKERY
Secretary
Social Science Education Consortium
855 Broadway
Boulder, Colorado 80302

CELESTE P. WOODLEY
Co-Director, Protocol Materials
Development Project
970 Aurora Avenue
Boulder, Colorado 80302

APPENDIX B

COLORADO COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

INVITATIONAL CONFERENCE

TRENDS AND ISSUES IN TEACHER EDUCATION

August 1-3, 1971
Stanley Hotel
Estes Park, Colorado 80517
Phone: 586-3371

Arrangements by: Social Science Education Consortium, Inc.
970 Aurora Avenue
Boulder, Colorado 80302
Phone: 443-2211, ext. 8155

CONFERENCE SCHEDULE

Sunday, August 1, 1971

11:00 a.m. - 1:45 p.m.	*REGISTRATION--*Lobby, Stanley Hotel*
12:00 noon - 1:45 p.m.	**LUNCH--*Dining Room, Stanley Hotel*
2:00 p.m. - 2:45 p.m.	PLENARY SESSION--*Music Room, Stanley Hotel (Main Building)* -- Frank Abbott, *Executive Director, Colorado Commission on Higher Education, presiding* Welcome--*Frank Abbott* Introduction of Staff and Announcements --Fran Haley, *Staff Associate, SSEC/TTT* "Trends and Issues in Teacher Education in Colorado" --Suzanne Wiggins Helburn, *Director, Colorado TTT Follow-Through*

*Expense checks for participants will be available at the time of check-out at the Conference Registration Desk in the main lobby.

**Hotel Registration for conferees has been arranged on the American Plan. No special dining arrangements have been organized, so conferees are free to take meals during the times specified in the program.

Sunday, August 1 (cont.)

3:00 p.m. - 5:00 p.m. — SMALL WORK GROUP DISCUSSIONS
"Trends and Issues in Teacher Education in Colorado"

Group 1--*Manor East, Stanley Manor House*
--James E. Davis, *SSEC Staff Associate, Group Leader*

Group 2--*Manor West, Stanley Manor House*
--John Haas, *Director, Center for Education in the Social Sciences, University of Colorado, Group Leader*

Group 3--*Ranch Room, Stanley Manor House*
--Nicholas Helburn, *Director, ERIC/ChESS, Group Leader*

Group 4--*Lobby One, Stanley Manor House*
--Celeste P. Woodley, *Program Director, SSEC, Group Leader*

Group 5--*Lobby Two, Stanley Manor House*
--W. W. Stevens, Jr., *Associate Director, SSEC, Group Leader*

6:00 p.m. - 7:00 p.m. — COCKTAILS--Cash Bar--*Pool, Stanley Hotel* *

7:00 p.m. - 8:00 p.m. — DINNER--*Dining Room, Stanley Hotel*

8:00 p.m. — PLENARY SESSION--*Music Room, Stanley Hotel*
--M. C. Davis, *Director, Colorado TTT, presiding*

--Donald Bigelow, *Director, Division of Program Resources, U. S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C.*

9:00 p.m. — Announcements and Planning for Monday Session
--Frances Haley, *Staff Associate, SSEC/TTT*

Monday, August 2, 1971

7:00 a.m. - 8:30 a.m. — BREAKFAST--*Dining Room, Stanley Hotel*

8:00 a.m. - 12:00 noon — REGISTRATION--*Lobby, Stanley Hotel*

---

*In case of rain, cocktails will be served in the Game Room.

Monday, August 2 (cont.)

8:30 a.m. - 10:00 a.m. NEW PROGRAMS IN TEACHER EDUCATION IN COLORADO
(Concurrent sessions - Select One)

1. UPSTEP - Undergraduate Pre-Service Teacher Education Program, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado
Lobby. Stanley Manor House

2. Human Relations Master Plan, Bell Junior High School, Golden, Colorado
--Manor West, Stanley Manor House

3. Widefield Teacher Training Program, Widefield School District #3, Security, Colorado--*Ranch Room, Stanley Manor House*

4. Teacher Corps, Southern Colorado State College, Pueblo, Colorado
--Manor East, Stanley Manor House

10:00 a.m. - 10:30 a.m. COFFEE--*Porch, Stanley Manor House*

10:30 a.m. - 12:00 noon NEW PROGRAMS IN TEACHER EDUCATION IN COLORADO
(Concurrent Sessions - Select One)

1. University of Northern Colorado/Manual High School Project, Greeley, Colorado--*Manor East, Stanley Manor House*

2. UPSTEP - Undergraduate Pre-Service Teacher Education Program, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado--
--Lobby One and Lobby Two, Stanley Manor House

3. Cooperative Teacher Education Program, Adams State College/Los Alamos Public Schools--*Manor West, Stanley Manor House*

4. Mountain View Center for Teacher Education, Boulder, Colorado
--Ranch Room, Stanley Manor House

12:00 noon - 1:30 p.m. LUNCH--*Dining Room, Stanley Hotel*

1:30 p.m. - 2:30 p.m. PLENARY SESSION--*Music Room, Stanley Hotel*
--Norman B. Dodge, *Assistant Director, Colorado Commission on Higher Education and Colorado TTT, presiding*

"Trends in Teacher Education in England, Australia, and New Zealand"
--Elwyn Richardson, *Staff Member, Mountain View Center for Environmental Education*

2:30 p.m. - 4:00 p.m. NEW PROGRAMS IN TEACHER EDUCATION IN COLORADO
(Concurrent Session - Select One)

1. Training for Cross-Cultural Involvement, Center for Research and Education, Estes Park, Colorado--*Manor East, Stanley Manor House*

Monday, August 2 (cont.)

2. Project Communi-Link, Colorado State University, Ft. Collins, Colorado--*Manor West, Stanley Manor House*

3. Teacher Training Experience for Inner City Schools, University of Northern Colorado, Greeley, Colorado--*Ranch Room, Stanley Manor House*

4. Competency-Based Teacher Education, Adams State College, Alamosa, Colorado--*Lobby, Stanley Manor House*

6:30 p.m.	COCKTAILS (Cash Bar) and CHUCK WAGON DINNER --*Pool, Stanley Hotel* *
8:30 p.m.	OPEN STAFF MEETING--*Music Room, Stanley Hotel* --*Participants are invited.*

Tuesday, August 3, 1971

7:30 a.m. - 9:00 a.m.	BREAKFAST--*Dining Room, Stanley Hotel*
9:00 a.m. - 9:30 a.m.	PLENARY SESSION--*Music Room, Stanley Hotel* Review of Conference from Observers
9:30 a.m. - 10:30 a.m.	SMALL GROUP DISCUSSIONS AND WORK GROUPS --*Conference Staff* --*The following rooms will be available:* *Manor East, Stanley Manor House* *Manor West, Stanley Manor House* *Ranch Room, Stanley Manor House* *Lobby One, Stanley Manor House* *Lobby Two, Stanley Manor House*
10:30 a.m. - 11:00 a.m.	COFFEE--*Porch, Stanley Manor House*
11:00 a.m. - 12:00 noon	FINAL PLENARY SESSION--*Music Room, Stanley Hotel* Recommendations for the Future
2:00 p.m.	STANLEY HOTEL CHECKOUT TIME

In case of rain, the cocktail party and chuck wagon dinner will be served in the Dining Room of the Stanley Hotel.

APPENDIX C

COLORADO INNOVATES:

A Directory of Alternative Teacher Education Programs

Compiled by

FRANCES HALEY

Staff Associate

SOCIAL SCIENCE EDUCATION CONSORTIUM, INC.

Under a subcontract from the

COLORADO COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

August 1971

Revised, October 1971

Introduction

In April 1969 the Colorado Commission on Higher Education received a Training the Trainers of Teachers (TTT) grant from the U. S. Office of Education. The TTT program, a nationwide effort initiated under the Education Professions Development Act of 1967, seeks to implement reform in our educational system through the education of teachers and, more particularly, through the education of educators. Major thrusts of the program also include:

- creating new ways to build genuine participation by community members in major educational decisions;
- creating new teacher education programs which involve cooperation between professional educators and faculty from academic disciplines in the design and implementation of more powerful teacher education curricula;
- providing a rich multicultural experience for all who intend to teach.

The overall objective of the Colorado TTT program was to promote the development of more effective inservice and preservice teacher education programs for teachers working in inner-city ghetto schools by organizing summer workshops for teacher educators in Colorado. These summer programs, run in 1969 and 1970, were to provide participants with a personal experience with ghetto life which would enable them to organize more effective teacher education programs. Participants in Colorado TTT represented a "critical mix" of people involved in curriculum design and implementation--college faculty from schools of education and the arts and sciences, public school faculty and administrators, community representatives.

The program focused on participants':

- learning through direct contact with the life styles of minority, disadvantaged children;
- developing more effective ways for teachers to base their instruction on an awareness of their students' learning needs and abilities;
- finding forms of cooperation between representatives of the critical mix of teacher trainers;
- finding ways by which members of the community can influence decisions about the education of their children.

In February 1971 the Colorado Commission contracted with the Social Science Education Consortium to carry out the final stage of the Colorado TTT program--an evaluation of the program to identify possible future directions.

The follow-through program assessed the extent to which the participants in the summer programs had implemented TTT objectives in their employing institutions. In the process of interviewing TTT participants and their institutional representatives, we learned of many other programs around the state designed to achieve goals stressed by the national TTT program. Furthermore, we began to notice common or typical kinds of reforms in the new programs. Professional semesters or years, early field experience, competency-based training, community involvement, cross-cultural awareness, public school-university cooperation are just a few examples of the new directions.

To get a clear picture of the statewide pattern of innovation, we decided to inventory teacher education programs at all institutions of higher education in Colorado and at as many public schools as seemed feasible. In order to do as systematic a survey as our budget would allow, we visited or contacted by phone all institutions in the state offering courses required for certification. In most cases, initial contact was made with the dean of the school of education or chairman of the education department. We then conducted interviews with others within the colleges or universities who were identified by dea[illegible], department chairmen and colleagues.

The task of assessing the state of inservice teacher education within the public schools was a more difficult one. Our limited budget did not permit a system-by-system inventory such as the one conducted at the college level. Instead, we relied on leads provided by the persons we interviewed in the colleges and in the public schools. Undoubtedly, there are many more programs being conducted throughout Colorado which are representative of the type and quality of program which will achieve TTT objectives. Nevertheless, the programs described here are the ones we heard about. They are probably the most publicized programs and they suggest the variety of approaches which are being used to provide needed inservice teacher education in different regions in the state.

A sincere effort was made to obtain written descriptions of all programs. There is always a certain amount of loss between the interviewee's verbal description and the interviewer's written notes, and we wanted to be sure to represent all programs as fairly as possible. In cases where we had incomplete

information, we talked with program directors by telephone to obtain such information. We apologize for errors of interpretation or omission, and urge you to contact the program directors of the individual projects for further information or clarification.

A few programs are included which are not operative at the present time. Some of these have not yet begun and others have been completed or phased out. They have been included here because of their unique ideas or contributions to teacher education.

Frances Haley
Staff Associate
Social Science Education Consortium
Colorado TTT Follow-Through
August 1971

Acknowledgements

Special thanks are due to M. C.Davis, Director, and Norman B. Dodge, Assistant Director, Colorado TTT, for their advice and assistance throughout the follow-through program; to Irving Morrissett, W. W. Stevens, Jr., and Celeste Woodley, SSEC staff members, and to John Haas, Director of the Center for Education in the Social Sciences, for their advice and assistance; to Suzanne Wiggins Helburn, Director of the TTT Follow-Through Project, who did a major portion of the interviewing and organization of the directory; and to Rachel Sennert, who made appointments, organized interviews, typed, proofread, and collated the directory, amidst a myriad of other tasks and responsibilities.

STATE OF COLORADO

INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION
Offering Courses Necessary for Teacher Certification

Institution	Address and Telephone No.	Dean or Dept. Chairman
Adams State College	Alamosa, Colorado 81101 589-7011	Eugene T. Kelly
Colorado College	Colorado Springs, Colorado 80904 473-2233	Robert Smith
Colorado, Univ. of	Hellems Annex Boulder, Colorado 80302 443-2211, ext. 6937	Karl Openshaw
Colorado, Univ. of Denver Center	1100 14th St. Denver, Colorado 80202 892-1117, ext. 276	Thomas Barlow
Colorado State Univ.	C123 Social Science Bldg. Ft. Collins, Colorado 80521 491-5305	Arvin Blome
Denver University	East Evans & South York Sts. Denver, Colorado 80210 753-1964	Robert J. Stalcup
Ft. Lewis College	Durango, Colorado 81301 247-7157	Donald Whalen
Loretto Heights College	3001 S. Federal Blvd. Denver, Colorado 80205 922-4368	Carl Barnhardt
Metropolitan State College	333 W. Colfax Denver, Colorado 80205 292-5190, ext. 262	George Brooke
Northern Colorado, Univ. of	McKee Hall Greeley, Colorado 80631 351-2817	Edward J. Kelly
Regis College	50th & Lowell Blvd. Denver, Colorado 80210 433-8471	Loretta Konecki
Southern Colorado State College	Pueblo, Colorado 81005 549-2681	Clifford Bebell
Temple Buell College	1800 Pontiac St. Denver, Colorado 80022 394-6012	Joel Greenspoon
Western State College	Gunnison, Colorado 81230 943-0120	Robert Corneer

INSTITUTION: Adams State College, Alamosa, Colorado

PROGRAM: Adams State College Cooperative Teacher Education Program

BUDGET: $19,450. $15,500. paid by Adams State; $3,950. paid by Los Alamos Public Schools

SERVED: 1970: 9; 1971: 12

LEVEL SERVED: Preservice, elementary

OBJECTIVES: To provide students pursuing degrees in elementary education with a realistic blending of methods instruction, student teaching practice, and experience in innovative instructional programs. To produce knowledgeable and competent beginning teachers who are able to function well in the decision-making, instructional, and human relationships aspects of the teaching profession. Specific objectives have been outlined for the student, the school district, and the college. These may be obtained from the project directors.

PROGRAM: Student teachers are assigend to the Los Alamos Public Schools for a period of twenty weeks (two college quarters). During this time, they live in the community. They have the opportunity to complete thirty to thirty-six quarter hours of work in professional education, replacing the basic methods and general education courses normally required on campus. Instruction in the program is provided by teams of public school teachers, chosen for their recognition as master teachers and their interest and preparation in specific subject areas. A methods course in a specific subject area is followed by teaching in that area. Students then take another methods course and teach the second subject; after completing methods courses in math, language arts, reading, science, and social studies, they teach all subjects for a three week period. Concurrent with these activities are seminars in observation, educational media and educational measurements. All courses are taught by personnel of the Los Alamos Public Schools.

EVALUATION: An evaluative instrument was constructed by a committee of students and instructors, designed to measure both the theoretical and practical aspects of the program. Results for both years (1970 and 1971) revealed that the program was regarded as a desirable change in approaches to teacher education. The 1971 program was somewhat revised as a result of the 1970 evaluation.

SPECIAL FEATURES: Cooperation between the public school and the teacher training institution; identification and utilization of teachers in the public school system to serve as methods teachers and cooperating teachers; in-depth time spent in the public schools by student teachers; simultaneous student teaching experience with theory and method.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION, CONTACT: Mrs. Hazel Craker, Box 435, Los Alamos, New Mexico 87544, Phone: 505-666-2559; Dr. Eugene Kelly, Adams State College, Alamosa, Colorado 81101, Phone: 303-589-7011

INSTITUTION: Adams State College, Alamosa, Colorado

PROGRAM: Adams State College Teacher Corps

BUDGET: $200,000. for two years; U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education grant

SERVED: 1970-71 and 1971-72: 26 students
1972-73 and 1973-74: 30 students

LEVEL SERVED: Preservice, elementary

OBJECTIVES: To establish a competency-based teacher education program which can be integrated into the teacher education program of Adams State College. To involve parents as decision-makers in the public schools.

PROGRAM: Teacher Corps interns are assigned to local public schools as staff members. During the two years in the teacher corps, they work towards competencies which are now being established by a group which includes college students, public school teachers, college professors, and community people. While attempting to reach their individual levels of competencies, Teacher Corps members are also attempting to help the public schools to which they are assigned reach their long range goals.

EVALUATION: The staff of the Teacher Corps Program is currently in the process of examining and trying various evaluation models. Further details are available from the Project Director.

SPECIAL FEATURES: Competency-based instruction; individualized instruction for Teacher Corps members; community involvement; integration of the model into the regular teacher education program.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION, CONTACT: Lawrence Gomez, Adams State College, Alamosa, Colorado 81101, Phone: 303-589-7802

INSTITUTION: The Colorado College, Colorado Springs, Colorado

PROGRAM: Master of Arts in Elementary Teaching; Master of Arts in Secondary Teaching (History, Government, Economics)

BUDGET: $2,000. per year salary to each intern paid by school district in which they serve

SERVED: 1971: 11, MAT elementary program; 4, MAT secondary social studies program

LEVEL SERVED: Preservice graduate students, elementary and secondary

OBJECTIVES: To provide teaching skills to persons with strong liberal arts background who have taken few, if any, education courses.

PROGRAM: The MAT program is fifteen months in length, beginning and ending with summer session. No master's thesis is required, although emphasis is on scholarly achievement in appropriate fields, and each candidate is required to write extended research papers in two courses. During the school year, they serve as teaching interns for one semester in schools in the Colorado Springs area. At the end of the second summer, the successful candidate earns an MAT and is recommended for certification.

EVALUATION: Evaluation of the M.A. candidates is conducted by the Colorado College staff, after consultation with cooperating school personnel. Program evaluation techniques are not outlined.

SPECIAL FEATURES: Salaried internships in public school classrooms; full teaching responsibility for one semester for each intern; flexibility in course selection; individualized attention; small classes on campus.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION, CONTACT: Robert Smith, The Colorado College, Colorado Springs, Colorado 80903, Phone: 303-473-2233

INSTITUTION: The Colorado College, Colorado Springs, Colorado

PROGRAM: Urban Teaching Program

BUDGET: Student teachers are provided travel allowance to and from the school in which they are student teaching by the Associated Colleges of the Midwest, sponsor of the program

SERVED: 1970: 2; 1971: 1

LEVEL SERVED: Preservice, elementary and secondary

OBJECTIVES: To provide students with the opportunity to observe and student teach in urban area elementary and secondary schools; to expose students to situations geared specifically toward a knowledge of the urban learner in several different settings; to provide seminars in urban education and urban sociology.

PROGRAM: The Colorado College is a member of the Associated Colleges of the Midwest (ACM) which is working in conjunction with the Chicago Board of Education to provide student teaching experiences in inner-city schools. The semester program is divided into a five-week and a ten-week period. During the first period, students participate in lecture and discussion sections of the urban sociology seminar; visit a number of effective learning centers; visit some of Chicago's inner-city elementary and secondary schools where they will assist in teaching. They also observe ACM staff who serve as teaching models in regular Chicago classrooms. During the ten-week assignment, student teachers prepare lessons and units for their particular school setting; participate in non-academic school activities; and confer about their concerns with the ACM staff and their cooperating teacher. Actual student teaching occupies mornings only, so there is also an opportunity for field work in urban sociology and urban education.

EVALUATION: The evaluation program is conducted by the ACM staff in Chicago. Procedures and results may be obtained from Associated Colleges of the Midwest, Urban Teaching Program, 60 W. Walton St., Chicago, Illinois 60610.

SPECIAL FEATURES: In-depth experience in urban education; utilization and exploration of the diverse facilities of the urban area which form the total learning environment of the student teacher; personalized counseling.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION, CONTACT: Dr. Charlotte Mendoza, The Colorado College, Colorado Springs, Colorado 80903, Phone: 303-473-2233

INSTITUTION: Colorado, University of, Boulder, Colorado

PROGRAM: Mountain View Center for Environmental Education

BUDGET: $176,00^, 1970-71; $368,000, July, 1971 through June 1975; Ford Foundation grant

SERVED: No records kept; estimated 500 plus per year

LEVEL SERVED: Preservice and inservice, elementary

OBJECTIVES: To show that existing public schools can evolve toward a conspicuously better level of performance, under their own leadership and power, but with help from supporting service organizations; to show that the advisory function can be transferred to the public school systems and assimilated by them; to permit schools to change their practice in order to provide: a) much increased diversification of schoolroom activities and alternatives open for childrens' choice and teachers' guidance; b) a large increase in raw and structured materials available for childrens' use and teachers' planning; c) a substantial enrichment of the resources for reading, writing, and other modes of communication; d) a change in the role of the teacher from one which is almost always instructional to one implied by a classroom which is sometimes a lecture room, but also often an expedition center and a library-workshop-laboratory-atelier.

PROGRAM: The Mountain View Center offers several courses during the week, open to anyone who is interested, to learn about possibilities for teaching and learning, using the environment. Courses are held after school for about four weekly sessions. Present class offerings include pendulums and balances, fossil hunting, rhythm and melody, weaving, games with the English language, stitchery, and "batteries, bulbs, and beyond." Workshops are held in the summer, with similar course offerings. The Center attempts to help teachers make wider use of the environment in which they live to teach their classes.

Training and programs are conducted only with those who request them. The Center keeps in touch with persons and institutions both in the United States and abroad who are conducting similar kinds of programs, in order to keep abreast of the wide variety of possibilities in educational practices.

EVALUATION: For information on evaluative procedures, contact the project director.

SPECIAL FEATURES: Utilization of the environment as a teaching tool; attempt to improve instruction through the exploration of new ways of learning and teaching; unstructured program; improvement of schools and school systems through improved classroom instruction.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION, CONTACT: Dr. David Hawkins, Mountain View Center for Environmental Education, The Armory, University Avenue, Boulder, Colorado 80302, Phone: 303-443-2211, ext. 8421

INSTITUTION: Colorado, University of, Boulder, Colorado

PROGRAM: Undergraduate Preservice Teacher Education Program (UPSTEP)

BUDGET: $347,000. for 15 months; National Science Foundation grant; additional funds for two succeeding years to be negotiated

SERVED: Approximately 600 students will be served by some phase of the program the first year; additional numbers will be served as the program progresses

LEVEL SERVED: Preservice, elementary and secondary

OBJECTIVES: To develop a teacher training program which will provide new interdisciplinary courses in sciences, social science and mathematics which emphasize the structure of the disciplines, broad concepts and skills, inquiry processes, and applications to teacher education, and which provide for individually selected and conducted laboratory experiences; to provide professional education which places students in experiential, laboratory-like environments which are flexible, realistic and stimulate involvement, which prepare them as high-level professionals for modern school programs, and which utilize self-paced units (or modules) of instruction; to integrate preservice and inservice training of teachers through cooperative university-public school programs; to establish, maintain, and improve communications and cooperative endeavors between the university and the public schools, between the Arts and Sciences faculties and the School of Education, and between all UPSTEP personnel and the several curriculum projects in science, social science and mathematics.

PROGRAM: The CU UPSTEP program is divided into two phases. The first phase is composed of three two-year components, one each in science, social science and mathematics. Each of these components is an interdisciplinary program with laboratory experiences, extending over four semesters. Students progress from the first phase to a second phase which is composed of two components--one in elementary education and one in secondary education. Each Phase II component reinforces the subject matter learning of Phase I, while emphasizing the professional knowledge of teaching and of schools that future teachers will soon be using. Each component includes laboratory, internship and student-teaching experience. Present throughout Phases I and II will be a variety of observation, tutoring and small group instruction, which are integral parts of all five components. UPSTEP students will spend up to three clock-hours per week in public school classrooms during both sophomore and junior scholastic years.

EVALUATION: The "Contact, Input, Process, Product" model for evaluation, developed originally at the Ohio State University Evaluation Center, has been adopted. This model is designed specifically to aid in providing information to support planning, programming, implementing, and recycling decisions. Evaluation will result in further refinement and change of the present proposed program.

SPECIAL FEATURES: Interdisciplinary; serves both secondary and elementary; cooperation between public schools and university and between school of education and academic areas; use of campus laboratory for training.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION, CONTACT: Dr. John Haas, University of Colorado, 334 Hellems Annex, Boulder, Colorado 80302, Phone: 303-443-2211, ext's: 8796 or 7227

INSTITUTION: Colorado, University of, Denver Center, Denver, Colorado

PROGRAM: Teacher Preparation for Urban Schools

BUDGET: $60,000. Noyes Foundation; $11,000. Denver Center and School of Education

SERVED: 30 students first year

LEVEL SERVED: Preservice, secondary

OBJECTIVES: To provide a teacher education program for secondary students in English and social studies which will: provide emphasis on attitudes, skills, methods, and materials for teaching in urban schools; provide students with specific content courses intimately related to understanding urban cultures and problems; provide students with opportunity to explore and participate in the culture of urban areas throughout three semesters; provide students with guided experiences as tutors and teacher aides in urban schools for three semesters; provide students with access, through weekly seminars, to guests knowledgeable in city, school and minority group problems; provide students with full-time pay as interns for one semester; establish a close working relationship with university instructors, student teaching supervisors, public school teachers and administrators, as well as community agencies.

PROGRAM: A two year (junior and senior) plus summer program, designed to prepare students to teach in urban schools, provides special experiences as follows: 1) course work directed towards methods, materials, discussions, lectures and assignments related to urban schools; 2) educational experiences involving tutoring and work as teacher aides in urban classrooms; 3) seminars held each week throughout the two years of the program; the first year these seminars will be devoted to general problems of the cities and the schools and the second year to specific problems of teaching and to interpersonal relations; 4) cultural experiences designed to thoroughly familiarize students with minority cultures through participation; 5) a five-day intensive immersion experience in the inner city prior to the start of the program for all staff members; 6) full-time teaching internship on a paid basis to replace student teaching; 7) establishment of close working relationships between university intructors, student teaching supervisors, public school teachers, and administrators.

EVALUATION: Evaluations will be made individually and in teaching teams during the internship; informal, subjective evaluation has been chosen in preference to standardized tests; however, program directors will experiment with a variety of tests.

SPECIAL FEATURES: Secondary students; in-depth training in cultural awareness; in-depth training in problems of urban schools and urban areas; paid internship to replace student teaching; all secondary education requirements oriented towards problems of urban education.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION, CONTACT: Dr. Donald Gallo, University of Colorado, Denver Center, 1100 14th St., Denver, Colorado 80202, Phone: 303-892-1117, ext. 362

INSTITUTION: Colorado State University, Ft. Collins, Colorado
(See complete list of participating institutions below.)

PROGRAM: Colorado Consortium for Head Start Supplementary Training

BUDGET: $70,000. September to June, 1970-71, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Child Development grant; $20,000. summer, 1971, Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Child Development grant; both grants administerd through a private contractor

SERVED: 500, 1967 to date

LEVEL SERVED: Preservice, early childhood, degree and non-degree personnel

OBJECTIVES: To provide college training for full-time employees of full-year Head Start programs on both a degree and non-degree basis.

PROGRAM: Fifteen institutions in Colorado provide training programs for full-time employees of Head Start programs so they can participate in college level programs. These institutions are: Adams State College, Aims College, Arapahoe Community College, College of the Canons, Community College of Denver, Colorado State University, El Paso Community College, Ft. Lewis College, Ft. Morgan College, Mesa College, Metropolitan State College, Otero Junior College, Southern Colorado State College, Trinidad State Junior College, and University of Northern Colorado.

Eight of the colleges offer new curricula based upon the core curriculum in early childhood development originally dèvised by the Consortium from trainees' requests. This curricula leads to an A.A. degree or 2 year certificate, or to a Bachelor's degree with a major or area of concentration in early childhood development. Curricula has been designed to meet the educational requirements for personnel in children's centers licensed by the Colorado State Department of Social Services.

Counseling services, both in the area of college adjustment and personal adjustment are provided. In cases where transportation is a problem, courses from the four-year colleges are taught at various community colleges and Head Start sites in order to provide continuous offerings for trainees.

EVALUATION: Evaluation of training personnel is done by trainees; trainee performance, by instructors; an institutional committee evaluates both; and all three--trainers, trainees, and the institutional committee--evaluate the entire program. General meetings of the Consortium are the final forum for assessment of the training program.

SPECIAL FEATURES: Cooperative effort between four-year and junior colleges to fulfill a felt need; program based on needs and inputs of participants; degree programs as an outgrowth of the program.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION, CONTACT: Mrs. Margaret B. Hanson, Colorado State University, E108 Rockwell Hall, Ft. Collins, Colorado 80521, Phone: 303-491-6130

INSTITUTION: Colorado State University, Ft. Collins, Colorado

PROGRAM: Project Communi-Link

BUDGET: $250,000. for the first year; U.S. Office of Education, Adult Education Act, Title III grant; refunding for 1971-72 will be approximately $300,000.

SERVED: Two rural communities in each of nine Western states; the project has directly worked with 70 to 100 people in each of these communities; the outreach of the 70 to 100 is inestimable

LEVEL SERVED: Adult basic education

OBJECTIVES: To improve professional and paraprofessional leadership, planning, and implementation of basic educational programs which then more effectively mobilize and utilize community resources to fulfill needs of rural disadvantaged adults. Specific objectives include the determination of communication patterns in designated states and communities; the provision of on-site instructional consultative assistance as support toward establishment of communicative linkages; provision of a workshop to experience "intercommunicative" approach and to evolve a communicative linkage mechanism; assistance to teams from target communities in the establishment of communications networks; continuous project evaluation.

PROGRAM: Project Communi-Link visits state level officials in the various target states to identify personnel at the state and local levels who will be supportive of the program and will also visit rural areas where their program might successfully be carried out. The project then conducts one or more workshops on the CSU campus to provide community representatives and state level personnel with a special "intercommunicative experience" in the form of the simulation game, Microville. This workshop also provides community representatives the opportunity to develop a plan of action for a communications linkage mechanism adapted to the basic adult education needs of their respective communities. Additional workshops are held on a regional, state or local community basis. The project makes several revisitations to each rural community to provide follow-up assistance and consultation.

EVALUATION: Both formal and informal evaluative measures will be used. Prior evaluations and data will be obtained in communities being served and terminal evaluations made at the end of the project year to determine community change and the impact of the project on the community. The CSU Human Factors Laboratory has been subcontracted to assist with evaluation, as has a three to five man team of evaluative consultants not connected with the project. Evaluative results are being compiled at the present time and may be obtained from the project director.

SPECIAL FEATURES: Adult basic education; methodology for involvement of community people from rural areas; use of simulation techniques to establish communications linkages.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION, CONTACT: Dr. James M. Kincaid, Project Communi-Link, Colorado State University, Ft. Collins, Colorado 80521, Phone: 303-491-6867

INSTITUTION: Northern Colorado, University of, Greeley, Colorado

PROGRAM: Teacher Training Experience for Inner City Schools

BUDGET: Tuition waiver by UNC for participating students; provision of bus by UNC for field trip to Four Corners area

SERVED: 24 students fall quarter, 24 students spring quarter

LEVEL SERVED: Preservice, elementary and secondary

OBJECTIVES: The objectives were designed in three areas: 1) the prospective teacher's understanding of and attitudes toward himself; 2) his understanding of and attitudes toward pupils and the processes of education; 3) his understanding and attitudes toward the educational system as an institution. Objectives representative of each category have been selected to indicate the thrust of the program.

The student will: enlarge his perceptual field to become more open and receptive to new experiences; expand his understanding of the extent to which his belief system influences the manner in which he perceives and relates to his fellow man and to the world about him; expand his capacity to perceive psycho-social causes of behavior through an understanding of the socio-cultural environment of children; increase his acceptance of the importance of being non-judgmental in his work with children; gain understanding of the multifaceted personal and professional role of the teacher, and knowledge of means through which the teacher can most effectively attain personal and professional satisfaction in his work; gain knowledge concerning the power structure and financial control of the school.

PROGRAM: Students receive eighteen hours credit for the teacher education core courses during one quarter of work. Methods and student teaching are the only education courses remaining after the one quarter experience. Participants spend much of the first four weeks of the quarter engaged in concentrated study in areas related to the specific course offerings of the program. The first week of the experience is a camping trip into the Four Corners area of the Southwest including daily visits to BIA and community schools as well as hiking, camping, and discussion periods. A three week on-campus period follows. The final phase of the program is a five week live-in experience with a family in the inner-city whose life-style is significantly different from that of the participant. One-half day a week during this period is spent working with children as a teacher-assistant in an urban deprived school of the participant's choice. Students also work at community and private agencies and participate in seminars to discuss solutions to the sociological, psychological and educational problems encountered during the program.

EVALUATION: Evaluative instruments used are the Dogmatism Scale by Rokeach (1960), Evaluation Scale VII, Kerlinger (1969), and The Personal Orientation Inventory by Everett Shostrom. In addition, subjective evaluations are done by staff members, supervising teachers, principals, and members of the live-in families. Students write weekly reaction reports and evaluations of all instructional activities.

SPECIAL FEATURES: Live-in experience for in-depth understanding; training for inner-city teaching; group dynamics; special program to replace regular education courses.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION, CONTACT: Dr. Roy Krosky, University of Northern Colorado, McKee Hall, Greeley, Colorado 80631, Phone: 303-351-2920

INSTITUTION: Northern Colorado, University of, Greeley, Colorado

PROGRAM: University of Northern Colorado - Manual High School Project

BUDGET: 1969-70: $77,000; 10% contributed by UNC, 10% Denver Public Schools, 80% Denver Model Cities Program
1970-71: $190,000 ; 20%, UNC; 12%, Denver Public Schools; 68%, Denver Model Cities
1971-72: budget is now under negotiation

SERVED: 60 undergraduate teacher education students at UNC; 1600 students at Manual High School; 105 faculty members at Manual High School; and the populace of the Manual community

LEVEL SERVED: Preservice and inservice; elementary and secondary

OBJECTIVES: To provide a relevant education to the students at Manual High School; to design a relevant teacher education program at the University of Northern Colorado; to enhance the existing program of educational administration at UNC. Each of these general objectives is supported by specific objectives to reach the major goals.

PROGRAM: There are two major phases to the UNC-Manual Project. The first consists of an inservice program for the teachers at Manual High School, as well as supportive services provided to the teachers at Manual by UNC. This includes such services as tutoring, specialized class offerings and consultant services. The second major phase of the project is the redesign of the teacher education program at UNC. Sixty students are chosen in their freshman year to participate in the program. The first segment of the program involves in-depth observation and exposure to the public schools, as well as curriculum offerings on the UNC campus relative to cultural and societal needs observed in the schools. The second segment involves more detailed work with classroom situations, including teacher aide work and micro teaching. During the third segment students spend time on campus and take a seminar designed by the arts and science faculty of the university, dealing with psychological, sociological and educational areas. At this same time students are trained to establish communication patterns among themselves and between themselves, community and school. The final phase involves classroom observations and student teaching in order to apply previous learning experiences in a practical situation. A unique aspect of this program is that planning is done primarily by students, community members and people from the schools of education and of arts and science.

EVALUATION: Evaluation has been conducted of the program and within the program. Procedures can be obtained from the project director.

SPECIAL FEATURES: Unique cooperating relationship between the university, the public school, the school of education, the school of arts and sciences, and the community; program decision-making by community members and students; training for understanding of minority cultures; replacement of "core curriculum" with interdisciplinary seminar.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION, CONTACT: Dr. Donald Luketich, 1007 20th St., Greeley, Colorado 80631, Phone: 303-351-2468

INSTITUTION: Southern Colorado State College, Pueblo, Colorado

PROGRAM: Southern Colorado State College Teacher Corps

BUDGET: $500,000. for two years, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education grant

SERVED: 32

LEVEL SERVED: Preservice, elementary

OBJECTIVES: To bring about improvements in public school education and in teacher education, focused particularly on the education of disadvantaged children; to train interns in the areas of cultural understanding, interpersonal relationships and community-based education.

PROGRAM: The Southern Colorado State College Teacher Corps has several components, including preservice training, inservice training of the public school teachers working with the students, and evaluation. In addition, there is a neighborhood program as well as a cross-cultural component. Interns are given intensive language training in either Spanish or Ute. Participants enter the program at the junior level and during the inservice phase are assigned to one of four elementary schools--two in Pueblo, one in Rocky Ford, and one in Ignacio--in teams of eight, working with children, teachers, parents, and other community members. The team member or intern does not replace the regular teacher; rather, his task is to give additional help to students while acquiring the skills of a teacher of the disadvantaged. Within the community, he works in education-related projects, such as tutorial centers, home visits and community projects. Teacher Corps members live as well as work in the community they serve. Interns receive a stipend of $90 a week plus $15 a week for each dependent, along with moving and travel expenses; health insurance is provided and they do not have to pay any tuition fees for college work.

EVALUATION: The Center for Research and Education in Denver, Colorado will work with project personnel to establish evaluation criteria and procedures. Measurements will be made through evaluation forms, interviews, observation (both participant and non-participant), and measurements of the various products of the project components. Information will be collected at quarterly intervals and a final report will be delivered to the project director at the end of the project. The final report will contain recommendations for changes in future Teacher Corps Programs and evaluation of the degree to which the terminal project objectives were achieved. Information regarding evaluative procedures and tentative results can be obtained from the project director.

SPECIAL FEATURES: Competency-based; community-based; training for cross-cultural understanding; cooperation between university, community and public schools; in-depth experience within the public schools.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION, CONTACT: Mr. Juan Trujillo, Southern Colorado State College, Library Building, Pueblo, Colorado 81005, Phone: 303-549-2759

INSTITUTION: Southern Colorado State College, Pueblo, Colorado

PROGRAM: Master of Arts in Teaching

BUDGET: Because the program is still in the planning stage, final budget figures have not been determined

SERVED: Estimated 100 master's degree students by the end of the first year of full operation

LEVEL SERVED: Graduate students at the master's level

OBJECTIVES: To provide a Master of Arts in Teaching program designed for certified elementary or secondary teachers who wish to obtain additional competency in teaching, enrich their backgrounds in the liberal arts and obtain additional breadth or depth in their disciplinary subject. The program is based on the belief that effective teaching requires both scholarship and professional competence. Therefore, emphasis is placed on the study of academic subjects, professional education, and related supporting activities. Eight competency areas have been developed for effective teachers. They are: planning, interacting with students, evaluating student progress, analyzing and evaluating teacher and the classroom environment, developing the curriculum, interpersonal competencies, socio-cultural competencies, and professional competencies.

PROGRAM; The basic approach of the Division of Education of Southern Colorado State College towards establishing the MAT program has been: 1) formulating statements of competencies expected of the professional teacher; 2) identifying the extent to which applicants for the MAT program possess or lack these competencies; 3) planning programs with MAT candidates; 4) providing experiences calculated to assist each person to achieve the competencies deemed necessary for him; 5) assessing this achievement in order to provide reasonable assurance that the individual receiving a Master's degree is a fully competent teacher. At the present time the program is in the developmental stage, and will be operative in the Fall of 1972.

EVALUATION: Evaluation will be emergent as the program becomes functional. The planners and participants will be involved in evaluating the various components of the program and the effectiveness of the objectives.

SPECIAL FEATURES: Competency-based; flexible; permits tailoring of master degree work to the experiences, needs, background and aspirations of the candidates.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION, CONTACT: Dr. Clifford Bebell, Southern Colorado State College, Pueblo, Colorado 81005, Phone: 303-549-2681

INSTITUTION: Temple Buell College, Denver, Colorado

PROGRAM: Regional Center for Improvement of Instruction in Elementary Social Studies

BUDGET: $160,000. June 1969 to August 1972, National Science Foundation grant

SERVED: 87 trained directly by the project; outreach estimated at 500

LEVEL SERVED: Inservice, elementary teachers and administrators

OBJECTIVES: To strengthen the professional training of teachers; to improve elementary social studies instruction; to provide for the successful implementation of new social studies curricula; to create a setting for research in problems of teacher training and curriculum innovation.

PROGRAM: The Regional Center assists school districts and teacher-training institutions in Southern California, Nevada, Utah, Wyoming, Colorado, Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico, Arizona, and Texas to implement Educational Development Center's innovative curriculum for the intermediate level, Man: A Course of Study. During the academic year, staff members disseminate information about the program, conduct inservice workshops, serve as consultants to schools introducing the course, and teach preservice and graduate level courses.

School districts must commit five or more classrooms and teachers to the project, purchase a classroom set of materials for each teacher conducting the course, and arrange regular meetings of teachers presenting the course for the first time. These meetings are led by a person who has attended a summer institute for teacher trainers or who has taught the course.

The summer institute participants must teach Man: A Course of Study and then conduct inservice workshops for other teachers in their district who are using the program.

EVALUATION: The Arthur D. Little Company, Cambridge, Massachusetts, has been contracted by the Education Development Center, developers of the course, to conduct an evaluation of the course and training procedures on a nationwide basis. The evaluation will be completed by January, 1973. Procedures and results may be obtained from the evaluators.

SPECIAL FEATURES: Training program developed by curriculum materials developers; outreach from persons trained to a wider audience.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION, CONTACT: Thomas A. Fitzgerald, Jr., Temple Buell College, 1800 Pontiac Street, Denver, Colorado 80220, Phone: 303-394-6893

INSTITUTION: Bell Junior High School, Golden, Colorado

PROGRAM; Human Relations Master Plan

BUDGET: $5,000. per year from January 1970 through December 1973

SERVED: 900 students, 40 staff, plus community people

LEVEL SERVED: Inservice; junior high teachers and students

OBJECTIVES: To move toward a system of greater student and and schoolwide self-discipline; greater student and teacher involvement in school improvement; increased goal clarification and commitment to school objectives; greater individualization of instruction to meet student needs; increased teacher listening, counseling and caring for students and others--students and teachers will be happier; increased open communication between all concerned--students, home, staff, and administration; greater acceptance of responsibility by all for making of decisions concerning themselves; greater understanding of self and others.

PROGRAM: The program is designed around three basic categories: 1) man's relation to self, 2) man's relation to man, 3) man's relation to society. Initially, attention was focused on the first two categories, specifically the reduction of negative self-concept in students. Objectives were divided into three levels: Level 1, those that could be implemented the first year; Level 2, those that would be further developed the first year, but probably not implemented until the second year; Level 3, those that will be further developed and implemented the third year. At each level, the project has stated objectives, implementation activities, and evaluation activities. One example is given here for clarification.

Objective: Each student should have at least one experience in self-discipline each school day. Implementation Activities: Students will be allowed a period of time each school day during which he will have total responsibility to select and adopt an activity. The practice of requiring students to bring notes from home will be discontinued.

EVALUATION: Each implementation activity has an evaluation activity. For example, the evaluation activity for the above stated objective is: The number of students obtaining self-directed status will be an indication of greater acceptance of self-discipline. Attendance statistics will be maintained by para-professionals to determine the percentage of student attendance as compared to attendance with parents writing notes for absences. A higher percentage of attendance will indicate greater self-discipline on the students' part. In addition, continuous evaluation of all objectives and implementation activites is being carried out during the project.

SPECIAL FEATURES: Cooperative decision-making between staff, students, school board members, and parents; training for improved human relations for both students and teachers; "humanization" of the school.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION, CONTACT: Mr. Dick County, Bell Junior High School, 1001 Ulysses, Golden, Colorado 80401, Phone: 303-279-6627

INSTITUTION: Bell Junior High School, Golden, Colorado

PROGRAM: Staff Personal/Professional Growth

BUDGET: No special funding

SERVED: 40 staff members

LEVEL SERVED: Inservice, graduate level

OBJECTIVES: To create a more open and democratic school environment, characterized by a higher degree of involvement through active participation between parents, administration, certified and non-certified staff, students, and central office personnel. In planning to implement this program, objectives for staff development have been set as follows: To establish a new kind of relationship between Bell Junior High School and a college or university for a cooperative effort to design and implement an individualized master's degree program for Bell staff members. Objectives of such a master's program would include: cooperative participation in the attainment of Bell Junior High objectives; at least 60% participation by Bell staff and a sufficient number of college personnel to complete a two-year program; the bulk of program activities to take place in the local setting; theoretical input for the program be put to the test of application to problems relevant to the school setting; all graduate work activities and graduate credit for individual staff member's efforts to be recognized as a means to the end of improved educational opportunities for students in an open, trusting, and participative school environment.

PROGRAM: Basic requirement for credit for all staff enrolled in the program: 1) All staff must complete training in basic communications skills of sending and receiving. Each school year would be preceded by a two-day communication skills and problem-solving workshop, and regular meeting time would be scheduled for two hours every two weeks throughout the year to refine and improve these skills. 2) Each staff member will utilize Bell's professional information services to commit himself to read and discuss, with colleagues and/or students, no less than two journal articles per week each week of the year, dealing with the application of humanistic psychology to Bell and its classrooms. 3) Each staff member will read and discuss and/or critique in writing no less than one book per month, regarding the theory and application of principles of humanistic psychology to Bell and its classroom practices and activities. Each Bell staff member will select a Personal/Professional Growth Committee, comprised of a college professor, two faculty colleagues, and a counselor or administrator of their choice, and will design the remainder of their program to meet their unique needs and interests in growth toward desired organizational behaviors and student opportunity objectives.

EVALUATION: At the completion of two years, a master's degree candidate must bring documentation of the program activites completed and his assessment of his personal/professional growth toward objectives of the school district, Bell Junior High, and the students. This documentation will be submitted to the Personal/Professional Growth Committee, school principal, college administrative leader, and if desired by the candidate, the Golden area administrator. They shall deem whether his efforts toward personal/professional growth are sufficient to warrant the award of the Master's degree. If not, they will advise further activities and schedule another meeting.

SPECIAL FEATURES: Master's degree program designed to meet the objectives of the school, as well as fit the needs of the staff; unique cooperative agreement between a school and university (negotiations with institutions of higher education in Colorado are currently in process).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION, CONTACT: Dr. George M. Carnie, Bell Junior High School, 1001 Ulysses St., Golden, Colorado 80401, Phone: 303-279-6627

INSTITUTION: Cherry Creek School, District No. 5, Englewood, Colorado

PROGRAM: University of Colorado-Cherry Creek Schools Teacher Education Program

BUDGET: $39,000. ESEA Title III Planning grant first year;$75,000. total second year, shared financing by University of Colorado and Cherry Creek Schools; $94,000. EPDA grant, third year; $75,000. fourth year, EPDA Continuation Grant; final year, $50,000. EPDA Continuation Grant. The Cherry Creek Schools have a differentiated staffing program, not covered in this description, which is partially supported by portions of the above funds.

SERVED: 27

LEVEL SERVED: Preservice, elementary and secondary

OBJECTIVES: To improve the quality of elementary and secondary teaching in Colorado. To have this program serve as a catalytic agent that stimulates Colorado's educational institutions to innovate, to question traditional solutions, and to effect major cooperatively-planned improvements in education. Specific objectives of the program are: 1) to establish teacher preparation and continuing professional development as a continuous cooperative responsibility of both the university and the schools; 2) to increase the relevance of present teacher education programs to the real and rapidly changing social and educational problems the prospective teacher must deal with in today's schools; 3) to enable schools to develop and evaluate differentiated instructional roles and salary scales; 4) to minimize the wasteful loss of certificated teachers who leave the profession.

PROGRAM: As presently structured the program spans seven years from enrollment in college until completion of three years of experience in operating schools. The student acquires a sound general education in the first two years. In the third and fourth years students experience the first exposure to children and an actual school environment and begin the transition from university-oriented education to work and learning in the schools. During these third and fourth years, the student serves as an instructional assistant for the equivalent of two days per week in schools and other community agencies. The other three-fifths of his time is devoted to university courses in general education, in his subject specialty and in his districts, serving as a paid intern for about four-fifths of the day. The other one-fifth time is spent in university credit courses taught by the University faculty at the Cherry Creek Teacher Education Center. In the sixth and seventh years the student serves full-time in the schools with all the responsibilities of a certificated teacher. In addition, he continues to take one or two graduate courses each semester, which when coupled with two summers of graduate work, can culminate in a Master's degree by the end of the seventh year. Specific features of the program differ slightly for prospective elementary and secondary teachers.

EVALUATION: The program outcomes as well as external conditions and constraints are assessed. Specific procedures and results are available from the project.

SPECIAL FEATURES: Integration of university and public schools; long-range planning; coordination with other education agencies and programs; field experience in schools as well as community agencies; paid employment as a part-time instructional assistant and as an intern; means for developing and assessing a new bridge to professional tenure.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION, CONTACT: Dr. Milton Schmidt, 4700 South Yosemite Street, Englewood, Colorado 80210, Phone: 303-771-1184

INSTITUTION: Denver Public Schools, Denver, Colorado

PROGRAM: Career Opportunity Program

BUDGET: $195,000. 1971-72; $169,582. 1970-71; U. S. Office of Education, Career Opportunities Program, EPDA grant

SERVED: 50

LEVEL SERVED: Preservice, elementary, paraprofessional

OBJECTIVES: To insure low-income people living in urban areas job opportunities; to utilize public schools in the inner-city to provide on-site opportunities for an effective career opportunity program; to provide trainees with a school experience and an educational environment conducive to strong self-identity, self-confidence, and an economic self-sufficiency essential in a technological society; to provide on-the-job training within the schools coupled with academic work for college credit.

PROGRAM: The career opportunity program is a cooperative effort between the Denver Public Schools, Metropolitan State College, Denver Community College and Arapahoe Community College to provide college level work for low-income persons. There is a particular emphasis in recruiting on Viet Nam war veterans; however, both men and women are recruited.

Courses are offered which will enable participants to work toward a four-year degree, although they may discontinue training at established intervals and become non-certificated personnel. Areas of career involvement include general aide positions, such as clerical, instructional laboratory assistants, and community aides; classroom aides; and technical aides, performing technical skills in audio visual activities, language laboratories, shops, and health services.

Course content is related to the identified needs of the target areas served as well as to training which will lead to employment in non-certificated positions and in positions which will lead to eventual certification. Major areas of the training program are: basic understanding of position and responsibilities; communications skills; specific skills necessary to function effectively in a particular position.

EVALUATION: The project collects data related to objectives as well as observing and measuring trainee performance. The State Department of Education EPDA B-2 coordinator assists in the evaluative process. Results may be obtained from the project coordinator.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION, CONTACT: Tom McCallen, Denver Public Schools, Yuma Street Center, 2320 West 4th Ave., Denver, Colorado 80223, Phone: 303-744-3601

INSTITUTION: Jefferson County Public School District R-1, Denver, Colorado

PROGRAM: Career Opportunity Program

BUDGET: $168,500. 1971-72; $146,500. 1970-71: U.S. Office of Education, Career Opportunities Program, EPDA grant

SERVED: 70

LEVEL SERVED: Preservice, elementary, paraprofessional

OBJECTIVES: To conduct a training program with a reality orientation which derives theoretical principles from activity and involvement and is related to the unique role of the trainee; to provide trainees with basic skills through a curriculum in adult education or junior college program which is tailored to individual needs; to provide trainees with experience and training to involve parents in the education of their children; to recruit individuals from all low-income, racial, and ethnic groups served by the schools in the project; to provide opportunities for joint training for professionals and paraprofessionals to assist in the process of understanding and the achievement of common goals; to provide training for professionals and paraprofessionals to develop appropraite differentiated roles for each; to recruit low-income males and veterans as well as high school students into the education profession, especially at the early childhood level of education in order to provide an equitable balance of males and females; to identify agencies providing child care for young children and assist in the placement of children of trainees in such centers while the trainees are working or attending school; to provide for the economic security of trainees through minimum income provisions to insure that they or their children will not suffer undue hardship; to provide for the expenses incurred by trainees as they pursue their training.

PROGRAM: Metropolitan State College will be the degree-granting institution and accept all credits through transfer from the other associated institutions. In addition, Denver Community College, Araphahoe Community College, and Loretto Heights College will provide course work for trainees. Each student will receive counseling and program planning advice to enable him to apply his course work to a degree and eventual certification as a teacher; however, there is no requirement that any student must reach the certified level of training. Counselors from Metropolitan State College will provide students with advice on course selection to meet degree requirements. In every case, classes are held in facilities near the place of employment of the trainees. Students take work experience each semester in their area of interest. Schools in Jefferson County as well as in the San Luis Valley School District, Englewood School District, and Sheridan School District are utilized for trainee placement.

EVALUATION: The general evaluation plan is both formative and summative in nature. The formative evaluation includes feedback on: impact on students served; impact of project on trainees; impact of project on school system; impact of project on the school environment, and effectiveness of the training component. The summative evaluation consists of all formative evaluation over the period of a full year. The State of Colorado EPDA B-2 Coordinator assists in the selection of instruments and dissemination of evaluative information.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION, CONTACT: Dale Pennybaker, Jefferson County Public Schools, 809 Quail St., Denver, Colorado 80215, Phone: 303-237-6941

INSTITUTION: Jefferson County School District R-1, Denver, Colorado

PROGRAM: Secondary Education Institute

BUDGET: $86,000. U.S. Office of Education EPDA grant

SERVED: 78 junior high school faculty members and administrators from four schools

LEVEL SERVED: Inservice, junior high

OBJECTIVES: To change the perception of teachers as to their role in directing the learning of junior high school children. This objective required improvement upon inservice retraining methods by 1) extending the time devoted to this purpose; 2) providing the training in an operational situation; 3) stressing teacher sensitivity to the relationship between the processes and the content of learning; 4) involving principals, as instructional leaders, directly in the retraining efforts; 5) involving outside agencies, such as teacher training institutions and State Department of Education as active partners on a continuing basis; 6) deemphasizing the subject area departmentalization of the junior high school and emphasizing the interdisciplinary nature of learning and teaching; 7) providing lay assistant training, which focuses upon teacher needs and team differences, in a situation that closely approximates future assignments.

PROGRAM: The inservice training phase of the program involved the participants in the planning of the program; a training program designed to meet the needs of the participants which included sessions dealing with general assistance, lesson planning, team functions and support service, group dynamics and analysis of instruction, grouping, articulation of subject matter, student evaluation, and personal and program evaluation.

EVALUATION: Evaluation results show that the general goal of improving upon past retraining efforts was accomplished. The project director has available specific evaluation results on the program design, the impact on individuals and on the host institution (Arvada Junior High School), and major strengths and weaknesses of the program.

SPECIAL FEATURES: Provision of training during the regular school year at a fully operational school; shift from teacher-centered to student-centered instruction; involvement of participants in planning and execution of the program; released time for participants for involvement in training

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION, CONTACT: Carl Zerger, Administration Building, 809 Quail St., Denver, Colorado 80215, Phone: 303-237-6941

INSTITUTION: Mesa County Valley School District # 51, Grand Junction, Colorado

PROGRAM: Special Education Teacher Training Consortium

BUDGET: $15,000 Colorado Department of Education, P.L. 91-230, Title VI grant; personnel and resources for instruction provided by participating colleges and universities; facilities provided by local school district

SERVED: 163 from seven counties in western Colorado

LEVEL SERVED: Inservice, special education, elementary and secondary

OBJECTIVES: To provide inservice education for teachers in order to qualify them for certification in the field of special education.

PROGRAM: Designed to train special education teachers residing in the western slope area of Colorado, this program was a cooperative venture of the Pupil Personnel Unit, Colorado Department of Education, Mesa County School District, University of Northern Colorado and Western State College. The training sessions were designed to meet the expressed needs of the rural school districts in the area, which have an acute shortage of trained, qualified special educators.

The program, supported with adequate library facilities and three special education classes used for observation and practicum experience, was in session for five weeks. Textbooks and references were mailed to participants two weeks prior to the session; reading and writing assignments were due during a four-week period after the session. Teachers had the opportunity to obtain up to fifteen quarter hours of credit and were permitted under reciprocal agreements to transfer credits to any of the participating training institutions.

EVALUATION: A pre-assessment of needs was conducted in order to determine the program. Participants were asked to evaluate the quality of the course offerings. Merritt Vanderhoof of the Mesa County School District conducted this evaluation, and can be contacted for the results.

SPECIAL FEATURES: Cooperative venture between State Department of Education, local school district, college and university; program designed to meet specific needs in a district; reciprocal agreement between institutions to provide credit.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION, CONTACT: A. J. Paulmeno, Colorado Department of Education, Room 405 State Office Building, Denver, Colorado 80203, Phone: 303-892-2282

INSTITUTION: Pueblo School District # 60, Pueblo, Colorado

PROGRAM: Bi-Cultural Appreciation Inservice Program (BI-CAP)

BUDGET: No funding

SERVED: 1968-69: 60; 1969-70: 30; 1970-71: 60

LEVEL SERVED: Inservice, elementary and secondary

OBJECTIVES: To develop competencies to recognize the problems and needs of school age youth in the Pueblo Public Schools; to develop awareness in every teacher of the problems faced by disadvantaged, regardless of their ethnic background. Representative specific objectives are to develop: positive attitudes toward teaching all children; desire to help children solve their problems; respect for all children as well as an understanding and respect for their various home cultures; a recognition that various cultures have contributed to the making of the community and the nation; an understanding of the position of the school and the teacher in helping the student to develop positive attitudes about himself and his community; an understanding of the effects of environmental, cultural, familial and school influences upon the development of the student's self-concept and values; a development of a self-evaluation by teachers of their ability to understand the factors creating the problems of limited success and also their ability to make provisions for these factors in the light of student needs.

PROGRAM: Bi-CAP was started by a group of interested citizens in Pueblo and at Southern Colorado State College. The first program was an inservice teacher training institute. Speakers came in to lecture on the problems and issues surrounding minorities. The second year only new teachers in the Pueblo system were included. This year the program is part of the Pueblo Public Schools inservice teacher program and participants can receive graduate credit at Adams State College. This year's format was based on a workshop approach, utilizing the participants and any resource persons they should choose. Sessions were held on eight different dates, and on each date a session was conducted for elementary, junior high, and high school, making a total of twenty-four groups. The workshop problem for this year was "developing a positive self-concept," and included defining the problem and working towards its solution.

EVALUATION: Pre- and post-testing procedures are used. Evaluative instruments used and results of the evaluative procedures may be obtained from the program contact.

SPECIAL FEATURES: Inservice; cross-cultural understanding; program designed and implemented by volunteers.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION, CONTACT: Mrs. Arlene Sutton, Southern Colorado State College, Pueblo, Colorado 81005, Phone: 303-549-2681

INSTITUTION: Widefield School District # 3, Security, Colorado

PROGRAM: Widefield Teacher Training Program

BUDGET: $20,000. per year for three years, U. S. Office of Education, Title III grant; the school district has made $9,000. available to continue the program in the 1971-72 year

SERVED: 280 teachers to date

LEVEL SERVED: Inservice, elementary and secondary

OBJECTIVES: To develop a fully comprehensive individualized school program utilizing all facets of those exemplary and innovative programs which best seem to fit the system's needs. Specific objectives included staff retraining, student grouping on the basis of interest, materials to assist in the individualization of instruction, development of computer programs designed to provide student profiles from which learning prescriptions could be drawn.

PROGRAM: The project strategies relied on staff retraining and development to accomplish the general objective. Brigham Young University was contracted to conduct teacher institutes during the summers of 1968, 1969 and 1970. Instructional strategies employed in these institutes included presentations, demonstrations, discussion, and independent study. Participants then developed instructional units which were field tested with students during the summer to permit necessary revisions prior to the beginning of the fall term. Other activities included three mid-year conferences on individualized instruction; establishment of demonstration centers at four schools; academic year inservice courses on specific topics as deemed desirable by the project staff; workshops to develop materials; and organizing and financing the travel of teachers, to workshops and exemplary programs both within and outside the Widefield district.

EVALUATION: Program evaluations were conducted yearly by the project directors, representatives of the Colorado Department of Education, and by Brigham Young University. These evaluations are highly favorable and indicate that the strategies of staff retraining and deployment and the development of instructional materials had the greatest impact in achieving the project's objectives.

SPECIAL FEATURES: Inservice; individualized instruction of teachers; retraining of entire school district staff; federally funded program assumed by school district; contract with university for staff inservice training.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION, CONTACT: W. L. Stenson, Widefield School District # 3, 701 Widefield Drive, Security, Colorado 80911, Phone: 303-392-3481

INSTITUTION: Center for Research and Education, Denver, Colorado

PROGRAM: Designing, implementing, and measuring cross-cultural interaction training; participative, experiential, and competency goal-referenced educational approaches

BUDGET: Private funding; contracts have been in varying amounts; for further information contact project director

SERVED: 500

LEVEL SERVED: Preservice and inservice, elementary and secondary

OBJECTIVES: To prepare the learner to be accepting of different values and life styles, and enable him to communicate this acceptance; to provide him with the sensitivity and appropriate behavioral responses which will enable him to interact effectively with people in another culture; to prepare him to anticipate and cope with reactions of others to him as a stereotype of his culture; to prepare him to understand his own cultural background and cope with his personal reactions to new problems which his own bias might create; to prepare him to learn how to learn from new experiences.

PROGRAM: The focus of the Center's program is on the process of learning and on continued learning beyond the training experience. The learner becomes actively involved in the identification of educational needs, the determination of goals and objectives, and the establishment of criteria and means for measuring achievement. The learner participates in establishing and carrying out plans for achieving goals and objectives and for evaluating outcomes. To facilitate this process, an experiential model is used as a guide for structuring the learning activities, facilitating the work of the instructor, and enabling the student to learn (or relearn) how to learn.. "Experience" is defined as anything which has an impact on the student. Time is allowed for reflection, discussion, analysis, and evaluation of the experience. From this process comes insight, discovery, and understanding which are then conceptualized, synthesized, and integrated into the learner's own constraints and perceptions. The introduction of new information or understanding may require the individual to modify, elaborate, restructure, or even completely transform the particular construct. This new or modified construct is generalized to past and future experiences, giving rise to new or modified expectations.

EVALUATION: Evaluation takes on new meaning in this approach. The learner, being responsible for his own learning, shows increased interest in how well he is doing. He more readily learns to construct objectives and carry out measurements. A wide variety of techniques are employed, including new methods for measuring the affective domain. The evaluation process employs peers, the learner himself, and the instructor. The communication of measurement data and effective means for the learner to personally assimilate and process such data play an important role in the evaluation process.

SPECIAL FEATURES: Substantive emphasis placed on direct contact with culturally different people and their environment, and supported and reinforced through laboratory training techniques including small groups, situational exercises, role-plays, simulations, and games; personal interaction and group dynamics emphasized and supported with video tape replay and pencil and paper exercises; language and specific technical skill training may be integrated into this approach when required.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION, CONTACT: Mr. Richard Rocchio or Dr. Michael Tucker, Center for Research and Education, 2150 S. Bellaire, Denver, Colorado 80222, Phone: 303-759-9935

OTHER INNOVATIVE PROGRAMS

There are agencies or institutions engaged in teacher education in Colorado conducting innovative programs which we feel should be included in this directory; however, sufficient information for a summary description was not available to us. We are listing these programs with a notation on special features and information on whom to contact for further information.

CENTENNIAL SCHOOL DISTRICT R-1
P. O. Box 347, San Luis, Colorado 81152, Phone: 303-672-3691

Centennial has received a $25,000 Urban-Rural Schools planning grant from the U.S. Office of Education. The funds will be used to plan a five-year inservice training program for teachers, teacher aides and administrative personnel, to make Centennial a continuous progress school system. Community members, public school personnel and university people will be involved in the planning stage. Total five-year funding is expected to be approximately $250,000.

For further information, contact: Gilbert Garcia, Superintendent

HARRISON SCHOOL DISTRICT 2
1060 Harrison Road, Colorado Springs, Colorado 80906, Phone: 303-576-8360

Harrison has received a U.S. Office of Education Title III planning grant for $12,000 to train their staff in individualized instruction. They hope to receive $175,000 per year for three years following the initial grant. Their objective is to develop a program of diagnostic and prescriptive teaching that will enhance individualization of instruction and a school system where students are active participants in the educational process.

For further information, contact: Lionel Robertson, Assistant Superintendent for Instruction

JEFFERSON COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
809 Quail Street, Denver, Colorado 80215, Phone: 303-237-6941

The Jefferson County Public Schools have offered a summer school program for their teachers for the last seven years. Since its inception, an average of sixty teachers per summer have taken advantage of the program, at a cost to the district of approximately $7,000 per year. Teachers can obtain ten quarter hours applicable to a degree program or an equivalent amount of semester hours for advancement on the salary schedule. The program focus for summer, 1971 is on humanizing the classroom, diagnosis of and prescription of remedies for learning difficulties, small group techniques, and coordination and planning for team teaching. Teachers may pay $12.00 per credit hour tuition in order to receive University of Northern Colorado credit. The student summer school, which is a lab where teachers can try micro-teaching or teaching with behavioral objectives, runs simultaneously with the teacher summer school.

For further information, contact: Carl A. Zerger, Director Inservice and Summer School

LAKE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT R-1
P. O. Box 977, Leadville, Colorado 80461, Phone: 303-486-0160

The Leadville schools have contracted with a private firm, Combined Motivation Education Systems, to train their staff. Training was geared to bring about attitude changes on the part of the teachers. Their goal was to develop positive attitudes toward self and toward students in order to promote a more conducive learning atmosphere. Participants in the project have started to notice a change in the students as well as the staff as a result of the program.

For further information, contact: Nels A. Sullivan, Superintendent

LORETTO HEIGHTS COLLEGE
3001 South Federal Blvd., Denver, Colorado 80205, Phone: 303-922-4368

Loretto Heights College has developed a professional semester plan which provides for integrating the student teaching experience with course work in the areas of educational psychology and curriculum. The program emphasis is on potential teachers, students in the public schools, and others in the community with a general interest in the educational process.

For further information, contact: Carl Barnhardt, Chairman, Department of Education